Christianity and the Social Weal

CYRUS J. KEPHART

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

PRESENTED BY

Rufus H. LeFevre

BX9878
.5.K33

Christianity and the Social Weal

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 21 1952
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHRISTIANITY

and the

SOCIAL WEAL

By

CYRUS JEFFRIES KEPHART

1914
THE OTTERBEIN PRESS
W. R. Funk, *Agent*
DAYTON, OHIO

FOREWORD

Profoundly convinced of the need of social regeneration;

Believing that the Gospel of Jesus Christ alone reveals the conditions and the means of such regeneration;

Recognizing the Church of the living God as the agency for the promulgation of the Gospel;

This book is sent forth in the hope that it may contribute in some slight degree to the realization of these ends.

The Author

87

CONTENTS

Chapter I

Christianity a Social System . . 3

Chapter II

Social Principles of Christianity . 15

Chapter III

Social Principles, Continued . . 31

Chapter IV

Causes of Poverty 55

Chapter V

The Abatement of Poverty . . 79

Chapter VI

The Problem of Divorce . . . 104

Chapter VII

The Problem of Vice and Crime . . 123

Chapter VIII

Social Principles Applied . . . 149

Chapter IX

The Church and the Social Weal . 169

Chapter X

Life Spiritual and Service Social . 193

I

CHRISTIANITY A SOCIAL SYSTEM

I

CHRISTIANITY A SOCIAL SYSTEM

MAN is instinctively, universally, and tenaciously religious—conscious of supreme relations and supreme obligations to God.

He is also instinctively and unyieldingly hopeful of immortality, believing that somewhere, somehow, he shall live forever.

He also believes that his welfare in the life to come in some way depends upon his reconciliation to and fellowship with God here.

These facts go far to account for the emphasis that man has always placed upon religion and religious duties. These sentiments and convictions have also contributed largely to determining the historic interpretation of the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Expressing the same truth a little differently, man has always been looking for the immortal life; has viewed the present brief life as of small value as compared with the prospective, unending life. Many Christian teachers have seen in

the teaching of Jesus little except the pointing of the way to the future. When he says, "I am come that they might have life," many have understood him to be speaking only of the future life. His moral precepts have been viewed by many as requiring right conduct here chiefly as a condition of divine favor hereafter.

In other words, many have viewed the teachings of Jesus, both ethical and religious, as having value chiefly if not wholly because of their relation to the future. The kingdom of Jesus Christ has been viewed by many as wholly a spiritual kingdom to be enjoyed only after this life has closed; the reign of Jesus Christ as wholly a spiritual reign to be enjoyed only upon admittance to heaven.

The present life has been looked upon by many as essentially "a vale of tears," a stage upon which to prepare for the future; an opportunity for the attainment of the fellowship with God necessary to preparation for the life to be.

By this it is meant that the church has largely failed to see the interest that Jesus takes in

man in the present life; that much of his teaching relates specifically to this life, thus indicating the value and importance of the life here and now.

In failing to see clearly this direct relation of the teaching of Jesus to present conditions, the church has failed in large part to give specific attention to the practical interpretation and application of the teaching of Jesus as setting forth the fundamental condition for the creation of right conditions in human society now.

It is reason for great rejoicing that this inadequate estimate of the Christian system is being rapidly displaced, and that it is being recognized with increasing clearness that the teachings of Jesus have immediate and direct relation to the present life as well as to the future; that it is his purpose to regenerate and transform society as truly as to regenerate and transform individual lives; that "the government" is increasingly "upon his shoulders" now; that he is establishing a righteousness whose "fruit shall

be peace," and its effects "quietness and assurance" in human society on earth.

That Christianity is a social as well as a religious system, is clearly shown by the teachings of Jesus and of those associated with him.

John the Baptist, the herald of Jesus, said, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." When the Pharisees and Sadducees came to him, punctiliously exact in their religious observances he said to them, "Do not boast simply that you are children of Abraham, but live lives that will prove that you have turned away from hypocritical dishonesty, to lives of religious and social helpfulness." To the multitudes he said, "Go and serve your fellow-men. If you have two coats, give one to some one that has none; and if you have food, share it with those who have none." To the thieving publicans he said, "Stop your thieving. Collect no more in taxes than justice authorizes." To the soldiers, "Stop extortion by violence. Quit using your position, your military equipment and authority as aids to the gratification of selfish greed." These are

not exact quotations of language, but they are very exact quotations of thought as indicated by the language used.

With John there was no cant about ritualistic observances, but a call to social righteousness as proof of heart repentance. Josephus suggests that it is altogether possible if not probable that John lost his head because Herod feared that such teaching might excite a revolution. It is perfectly clear that whatever John understood as to the kingdom of God, viewed from the religious side, he understood that it meant as well a mighty change in the social order.

Jesus accepted John's teachings as to the kingdom, and himself went on to teach principles so revolutionizing in their influence that Emile de Loyola, the Belgian economist, says, "If they had been understood and applied conformably to his (Jesus') spirit, the existing social conditions would not have lasted a single day." In our own day James Russell Lowell said, "There is enough (social) dynamite in the New Testa-

ment, if illegitimately applied, to blow existing institutions to atoms."

The Sermon on the Mount and the parables of Jesus show clearly that the primary purpose of the gospel is the salvation of the individual; but they show as well that it proposes also the reconstruction of society, so that there may be attained deliverance from enemies and from them that oppress, and that the time is to be expected when in reality every one shall live in peace and prosperity "under his own vine and fig tree."

The first text from which Jesus preached after his return to Nazareth following his baptism sounded the key-note of his purpose, and it was largely social in its meaning and application: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor, he hath sent me to proclaim liberty to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." It sounds like the proclamation of the

Jewish year of Jubilee, when alienated possessions were returned to the families to whom they had been originally allotted, and when Hebrew slaves were set free. It is quite like the inscription on the old Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, and to all the inhabitants thereof."

True, the words read by Jesus have a distinctly religious meaning; but the teachings of Jesus throughout show that he intended that they should have a social interpretation as well.

But, is there a call to-day for Christianity as a social system? Have not conditions so changed since the days when Jesus lived as to render this phase of Christian teaching both unnecessary and impractical?

We are living at an exceedingly interesting period of the world's history. Remarkable changes, and changes for the better, have occurred since the days of Jesus. History reveals no other period when there was such widespread intelligence as in this; no period in which there was such remarkable development of the means

of promoting intelligence, or of increasing the productiveness of human labor.

The same may be said as to the development of the science and the art of government, whether municipal, state, or national. And yet, to say that human society in its most advanced stages presents even a near approach to ideal conditions would be to depart widely from the truth.

Widespread and increasingly abject poverty alongside of increasingly immense fortunes; disturbed relations between employer and employe; the presence of institutions whose inevitable effect is to debase and debauch men and women; disturbed political conditions, local, nation-wide, and world-wide; the conception, widely prevalent, that war is the legitimate court of appeal between nations, evidenced by immense standing armies, increasing military equipment, and the present awful, unjustifiable, unprecedentedly inhuman, and destructive European war; these conditions in professedly Christian lands, aggravated by vastly worse conditions in semi-civilized pagan lands, are themselves evidence suffi-

cient that the race is yet far removed from ideal conditions, shown to be possible by the nature and capabilities of men, and by the revealed word of God.

All this and much more shows that there is need of the promulgation and application of some effective system of social renovation. And since Christianity claims to be a scheme of social betterment, as well as a system of religious teaching and practice, it is proper and right to investigate it, and ascertain whether the principles it teaches are such as to justify the conclusion that, if applied, it will solve the problem of social betterment for the race.

II

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY

II

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY

WHAT are the social principles set forth by the Christian system, by the application of which it proposes to effect the regeneration and transformation of human society?

Since it is conceded by all that Jesus, the man of Nazareth, was the founder of the Christian system, and himself its supremely authoritative teacher, it is to be expected that the social as well as the religious teachings of the system will be stated by him, at least as it relates to fundamental principles. What are those principles as taught by Jesus, relating to social regeneration or renovation?

In seeking these principles regard must be had to two facts.

The first is, that Jesus was not an abstract theorist, but was a plain man of his times, speaking concretely as to conditions about him, and of social and religious needs, but so speaking as

to express clearly the fundamental principles underlying his teaching.

It is with the discovery of those fundamental principles, rather than with the concrete application of his teachings, that we are concerned.

The second fact is, that his social teachings are most intimately associated with his religious teachings; so intimately related as to show clearly that it was his conception that the attainment of ideal social conditions is possible when sought along with the attainment of ideal religious conditions. That is, that while Christianity presents a social system, its social teachings can be most effectively applied only as its religious teachings are applied.

It is of vital importance to an understanding of the social teachings of Jesus, that this last truth be understood and recognized. For while there is abundant reason for saying that the social principles taught by Jesus Christ far excel those taught by any other, yet the Christian social system depends for its efficiency upon the spiritual vitalization of the social truth it im-

parts, and upon the proper attitude toward God of each one who accepts and proposes to act upon these social principles. That is, the Christian system holds that man is first of all a religious being, owing his first obligation to God, and that only as he stands in such relation to God as to be vitalized by his Spirit, will he be in condition to appreciate and apply effectively the social truth taught by the Christian system. And also, that just as man, though twofold, religious and social, is unified, centered, and must be vitalized in his religious nature, so also the Christian system is twofold—religious and social, unified, centered, and vitalized from the religious side.

This being true of man and of the Christian system, it will not seem strange that in the teachings of Jesus, the two phases of his teaching, social and religious, are so closely woven together that it is scarcely possible to view them separately without doing violence to each.

There are four fundamental social principles announced in the Christian system, each sufficient in itself, if fully applied in each individ-

ual life, to transform and idealize the entire body of human society; each so efficient because the presence of any one of them involves in principle the application of the others. When all present in fact they form a social equipment beyond which, so far as fundamentals are concerned, there is nothing to be desired.

The first of these principles or requirements, is the complete moral integrity of each individual.

Expressing the truth in the language of Jesus it is, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

It may seem strange to present as a social principle, this which has always been regarded as one of the distinctively religious teachings of Jesus.

It is religious, but it is social as well. Jesus announced the necessity of the new birth to individual righteousness—which means rightness, integrity—not simply as a condition of admission to heaven, but as the primary condition of seeing, entering, and interpreting the kingdom

or reign of Jesus Christ in human society. Christianity is peculiarly individualistic. Not in the sense of overlooking or ignoring society, but in the sense that it approaches society from the side of the individual. It seeks the regeneration of society by means of the regeneration of the individual. It recognizes that the primary need is the new-born man, new-born to social as well as to religious integrity. Other systems of religion held, and now hold, that the great need of man is to win favor with God. Jesus Christ teaches that man has the favor of God, and that the great need is to get the individual man right, right with God and right with fellow-man.

This is the great social need to-day. Forms of organic social reform are proposed. No doubt they possess some merit. But the fundamental wrong in society is not to be found in its forms of organization, but in wicked, perverse men, who will twist any form of organization for the attainment of personal ends.

If there are political wrongs, industrial wrongs, ecclesiastical wrongs, as there are, it is

because there are bad men in politics, in commerce, in industry, in the church.

The fundamental principle in Christian sociology is, "Secure right individual lives as the fundamental condition of improved social conditions." Nor is any argument needed to show that if there can be attained the universal righting of individual lives, there will come as a necessary result, the righting of all social conditions. True, this is highly ideal, but it is correct in theory; and more; application proves it correct to whatever extent the principle is applied.

The second social principle announced in the Christian system, is the essential equality of all members of the human race.

True, Jesus at no place makes such a declaration in so many words; but this principle is fundamental in all of his teaching. He is indeed the great commoner.

It is clearly taught in the first utterance of the Lord's prayer, "Our Father"; for by this he teaches the fatherhood of God as universal;

hence the universal brotherhood of man; hence the universal essential equality of all the members of the race. It is clearly taught also in the fact that Jesus gives for all, one and the same set of teachings, both religious and social, thus showing that the relations, obligations, and duties of all are the same. This can be true only upon condition of the essential equality of all. This fact of essential equality is proved also by the fact that the teaching of Jesus is equally applicable to all people of all races.

By essential equality is not meant that all are equal in ability or capability; but that in all the essentials that belong to man as man, there is essential equality.

Out of this fact, or principle, comes another closely related to it, of first importance in the construction of an ideal social system. That is, that since men are essentially equal, then, conditions being equal, they have the same or equal rights.

But this latter statement must be properly interpreted and understood. It is not intended

here to teach that the immature child or the barbarian is prepared to exercise all the functions that belong to the mature or highly civilized man, for the simple reason that such are not capable of exercising those functions for their own welfare or for the welfare of society. It is not intended to teach that vicious and criminal men are entitled to the exercise of the same rights as citizens who are virtuous and law-abiding men. But it is meant that as men, even these are the equal of any other men, and have essentially the same rights. It is the same truth that is declared in our immortal Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Some deny this, and cite in proof of their position the admitted difference in men, intellectually, physically, in moral character, and in social standing, as proof. But it is no proof of error in this idea of equality as taught by Jesus Christ and as declared by our forefathers.

It is upon this fact, the essential equality of all men, that rests, practically at least, the truth that justice demands the same for all, under like conditions. The same award or sentence for all under like conditions can be righteous only when all parties concerned are essentially equal. If we could conceive of society where in fact there should exist, by right, a difference in rank, then we must think it just in such society to grant special favor to those of higher rank. It is upon the assumption of this difference in rank, and therefore in right, that those base their argument who affirm and attempt to defend the superior claims of some over others. Here is also the basis of the attempted defence of the assumed "divine rights of kings." There are no "divine rights of kings," except as they and all public officials represent divinely authorized civil government.

Jesus recognizes in men no ranks or inequalities in essentials. Here, in the common equality of all men, is the rightful basis for the claim of every man to that which is due him as a man;

and of the right to deny to any man, whatever may be his position, and to any institution, whether it be political, ecclesiastical, commercial, industrial, or social, to deny to all such the right to treat any one as other than a man, the equal of every other man.

Here, in the common equality of all men, is the rightful basis for the denial of the right of any man, or of any institution, to attempt to defraud any man, woman, or child, of anything that is justly his as the equal of every other.

Here, too, is the rightful basis for the denial of the right of men or of institutions, at the cost of the unrequited toil of others, to pile up unlimited fortunes, while multitudes by whose toil and sacrifice they have profited, are compelled to endure the hardships that inadequately remunerated toil and selfish greed impose.

And when Jesus Christ throughout his teaching declares this fact of the essential equality of all, he not only rebukes all the injustice that selfishness imposes, but he strikes the blow that ultimately must tell to the defeating of all such

men, to the destroying of all such institutions, and to the creating of equal opportunities and advantages for all. This end will be realized, however, only when the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ becomes dominant in individual and in social life.

When Jesus Christ taught his disciples to pray, "Our Father," he sounded the death knell to human slavery and to every institution, political, commercial, industrial, and ecclesiastical, that by practice of injustice and oppression has cursed and is cursing human society. In this he also announced the fundamental principle of human equality, upon which to erect institutions that will secure to each man, woman, and child, that which is justly his, and thus establish harmony and peace universal.

A careful study of the Jewish prophets will reveal the fact that they saw in outline this same fundamental principle of equality; but they were not able to lead their people up to the plane where they would apply the principle effectively in the institutions of society. And sad to say,

though Jesus announced this principle nineteen centuries ago, the prophets and teachers of the Christian system have been only a little more successful than were the Jewish prophets in securing its application.

Whoever and whatever may be responsible, it surely is true that even in the most highly Christianized and civilized lands, there are widely varying conditions of human life. Extremes of wealth and poverty; unjustly unequal distribution of the products of toil and industry; vice and crime and institutions for the promotion of both; political injustice and inequality; commercial greed and its consequent robbery, all bear indisputable evidence that the conviction of essential human equality, and of equal essential rights, as announced and promulgated by Jesus Christ, is not yet in any respect nearly recognized as a governing principle in individual life, nor in the institution of society.

It is not at all remarkable, therefore, that, with the more widespread teaching of this fundamental principle of equality, along with a

growing intelligence and a clearer understanding of the rights of the individual and of society, there is a growing restlessness and determination to secure the establishment of conditions under which this fundamental truth of the equality of all shall be more clearly acknowledged; acknowledged by giving it a controling sway in politics, in commerce, and in the industries of society.

This determination is manifesting itself in an increasingly widespread and irresistible effort to democratize political institutions; to secure to society proper oversight or control of the commerce and the industries of this and of other nations; to compel individuals and corporations to pay due respect to the rights of men and of society.

All this is increasingly strong evidence of the growing conviction of the righteousness of this fundamental social principle first clearly announced and made effective by Jesus Christ; it is therefore an increasingly strong tribute to him, and an increasing acknowledgment of the

fact that Christianity is a system of social reform as well as a system of religious quickening.

III.

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES, CONTINUED

III.

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES, CONTINUED

THE third social principle anounced by Jesus Christ is what may be termed the fundamental law of human conduct; "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also unto them likewise."

This is a necessary implication from the principle of brotherhood and equality. It need scarcely be said that the failure of men to act toward each other in harmony with this fundamental and comprehensive law, is one of the monumental producing causes of the evils that distress and disrupt human society. Scarcely more need it be said that, if this law were universally observed, the evils of society would rapidly and largely disappear. It is equally true that, to the extent that men conform their conduct to this law, to that extent the betterment of society is and will be realized.

Several characteristics of this rule of conduct need consideration.

It is a positive statement, and therefore constructive in its application, marking out a course of aggressive, helpful activity. In this respect the precept of Jesus differs from, and by far excels the negative precept of Confucious, "What you would not wish done to yourself, that do not to others."

This precept or principle, as taught by Jesus is universal, universal in two relations. It applies to all men in all relations, and in all conditions; viewing it from the side of social activity, to men as employers and as employes; to men as sellers and men as buyers; to men skilled and men unskilled; to men successful and men unsuccessful; to men of every race and of every color; to men strong and men weak. It is applicable to men and women. It is universal as to those to whom and by whom it is to be applied.

It is universal also in its application to activities; "All things whatsoever." It embraces the entire field of possible human effort. It is not,

"All things that you do to or for your fellow-man, do as you would have him do the same for you." It, of course, embraces all that. But besides and far beyond all that, "All things that you would have him do for you, do that for him." Hence it covers what one can do, as well as what one does.

It is evident that, in laying down this principle, Jesus recognized clearly the essential equality of all men, and that fact must be seen as a condition necessary to a proper application of this principle. The only basis or ground of right for requiring one man to do for another what he would have the other do for him is, that he and the other are in every essential the equal one of the other. Each must be the equal of the other, or one or the other is not a proper subject of comparison in deciding what should be done.

It is to be observed also that, while this principle inculcates the virtue of unselfishness, it does not go so far as to require or even encourage self-forgetfulness. There is in it a distinct regard for individual or personal rights. Indeed

it announces consciousness or conviction of what is due to one's self as the ground of judgment as to what is due to another; "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you."

Read only that far, however, it might be concluded that selfishness or self-interest should form the basis of action. Such might seem the case, but for the remainder of the precept, "even so do you to them likewise." The measure, not of selfish desire, but of action for fellow-man is to be determined by what one would choose for himself.

Therefore, while this law in its application turns upon regard for one's self, it is such a regard as does not overlook the right of others, nor of society at large. It prescribes as the rule of the life of the individual, in his attitude and conduct toward his fellow-man, that he shall determine his attitude and measure his conduct upon the twofold basis of the relation of himself and his fellow, as each the equal of the other, and as both alike related to society at large.

The Christian system prescribes this as the universal law of conduct between neighbor and neighbor; between employer and employe; between seller and buyer; between ruler and ruled, except as the ruler stands as the chosen representative of society.

What would be the result of the universal application of this law of conduct? The answer would of necessity be theoretical, for the reason that there is nowhere in actual life a full illustration of such application.

A more helpful answer may be had to the question, "What would be the result if the Golden Rule were practiced generally?"

In view of the fact that ideal results obtain only under ideal conditions, and since the application of this rule "generally," which means partially, would not represent ideal conditions, the conclusion as to the result must represent tendencies rather than ultimate ends and accomplishments.

One of the beneficial results of the enlarging application of this fundamental rule of con-

duct, its application approaching toward what might be termed "general," would be to bring into clearer recognition related fundamental principles. One of the greatest advantages that has come to America and to the world as the result of the establishing of our free institutions, has been the increased interest aroused in the question of human rights; so great and widespread has been this interest that to-day an absolute monarchy is almost an impossibility in any land where people possess even a creditable measure of intelligence.

As men shall more generally determine their lives and their conduct, not by the limitations prescribed by legislative enactment, but by personal application of this great moral precept, this constructive principle of human activity, a most important and remarkable result will be a clearer understanding of the essential equality and of the essential equal rights of all people, followed by a quickening of the social conscience, which will in turn awaken a still greater interest in, and effort toward, determining just what is

involved in this fundamental fact of the equality of all men, with the further reflex result of a vastly more careful application of this precept. And no greater social benefit could come to society as a condition preparatory to increasing social betterment.

One reason why the Golden Rule is not more generally and more effectively applied is because of a lack of a clear apprehension of its meaning and significance. Thousands of men are socially narrow and selfish, because they have no adequate conception of the equality and of the equal rights of people with whom they are associated in business, on the street, in the church, and elsewhere. Men and women have been known to go to church, professedly to worship God, and then scowl and frown when some one, their equal in every essential respect but beneath them in social rank, has unwittingly taken a seat in their pew. Men in business, possessed of larger wealth than others, have been known to look and act with unconcern if not disdain upon patrons in business, their employes, or those less successful in

business than they, because they have not reflected upon the fact of the common equality of all men, thus failing to apply this leveling and uplifting law of conduct. Yet all of them, church men, business men, society women, will declare that they believe in the Golden Rule, and in the equal rights of all. The difficulty with such is that they do not think carefully nor clearly.

But with an increasing application of this law of true social conduct there will come an ever-enlarging understanding and application of fundamental principles related to it, and a higher appreciation of the true worth of human kind.

A further result of the practical application of the Golden Rule would be the displacement of ruinous competition by a type of co-operation that would inure to the benefit of the whole of society.

Some will say, "But that would ruin trade, for 'Competition is the life of trade.' " Some think so, but others quite as deserving of consideration think otherwise. Frederick Dennison Maurice, by Walter Rauschenbusch styled "one

of the finest minds of England in the Victorian Age," says, "Competition is put forth as the law of the universe; that is a lie." Charles Kingsley said, "Competition means death; co-operation means life." Rauschenbusch says, "Competition has proved itself suicidal to economic welfare."

In a sense it is true that competition is the life of trade. But it has also frequently entailed ruin upon men engaged in trade. The modern effort to eliminate competition by means of combination and monopolization of business is ample evidence that competition unrestrained is ruinous to business. The increasing determination to exercise control over business through State and National legislation, with a view to creating conditions where opportunities in business shall be equal for all, is strong evidence of the increasing recognition of the evil of unrestrained competition, and of the value of co-operation as a true business principle.

Nor are the ruinous effects of competition confined to the business world. Its effects are felt largely in the church. Recognizing that the

church has a legitimate mission to society, it must be conceded that nothing destroys its influence and its capability for good more than local competition between churches striving for the supremacy in given communities; competition as really selfish and devoid of the spirit that should dominate the church as is found in the commercial world. "Competition" has no legitimate place in the vocabulary of the church. Of like character and influence is competition for official position so often seen in local and general councils of the church.

All this will be abolished when the church comes to the place where it recognizes fully its social as well as its religious obligations; when it recognizes in fact the equality and the equal rights of all men, and actually applies the Golden Rule, the rule of friendly co-operation in church life and activity.

Equally destructive of good is competition in the social world. From state and diplomatic circles, from the palaces of kings and homes of presidents down to the smallest social club or

fraternity, "Who shall be the greatest?" has been one of the disturbing and distracting social questions. What changes would be wrought if this simple principle of social equality were permitted to take the place of selfish egotism? If men and women should inquire, not, "How can I secure the first position of honor?" but "How can I best show to others the same respect, and render to them the same helpful service that I may justly ask for myself?"

It is the application of this same selfish principle of competition in the political realm that renders political contests, municipal, state, and national, so often a disgrace to all concerned in them—the expression of selfish ambition for promotion, or for the spoils of partisan victory.

The practical application of the principles of equality and co-operation expressed in the Golden Rule, properly interpreted, would eliminate all this and bring to society benefits inestimable. Equally beneficial results would follow the introduction of the unselfish, co-operative principle in the business world.

It will be answered by some that while the moral results might be good, the application of such a principle in business would end business prosperity. But it is coming clearly into view that right moral principles lie also at the basis of true business prosperity. If the principle of equality, and the rule of co-operation, expressed in the Golden Rule, are right morally, they cannot be wrong commercially, and their practical application must therefore add to real commercial prosperity. Otherwise there is an irrepressible conflict between the moral and the commercial worlds, a conception which the principle of universal unity at once contradicts. Either the principles of human equality and co-operation are applicable with good results in the business world; or, these principles are in themselves wrong morally; or, business prosperity is itself wrong morally; or, there is an irrepressible conflict between the moral and the commercial worlds. To say that the principles set forth in the Golden Rule are right morally, and then say that their application in business would end

business prosperity, is to say that business prosperity depends upon the practice of principles that are morally wrong, a conclusion wrong in principle and in practice.

The fact is that very much of the evil that individuals and society suffer in the business world, whether commercial or industrial, is the result of the violation of the fundamental moral and social principles of equality and of equal rights, such violation being upon the part of either buyer or seller, employer or employe.

Altogether too largely the dominant principle in the commercial and in the industrial world, from whichever side it is viewed, is the selfish principle of personal greed. The result is a state of constant strife and unrest, entailing almost immeasurable loss upon both employers and employes, as expressed in the results of strikes, lockouts, boycotts, and the consequent depression of business and trade.

There is no reasonable ground for saying that either side of this unrest and struggle expresses either the morally right or the commercially wise

in the full sense. The right and the wise lies between them, and it is not difficult to determine, theoretically, where. It lies at the point where, by the practical application of the Golden Rule, the law of mutual co-operation, employer and employe, each with proper regard for the other, will not only concede the rights of the other, but will work mutually for the welfare and well-being of the other. The same principle applied in the commercial world generally would result in the mutual well-being of all, whether buyers or sellers.

Would the application of this principle operate to prevent the accumulation of vast fortunes and the abatement of poverty, by effecting the more equitable distribution of wealth among all? So far as the accumulation of fortunes is the result of the application of the principle of selfish greed and the disregard of the rights of fellow-man, it will so operate, and ought to. So far as the accumulation of fortunes is the result of unselfish but well-directed energy to the development and distribution of the resources of

nature, it will not so operate, and it ought not to do so. So far as poverty is the result of selfish indulgence, indolence, and disregard of the rights of others, it will not operate to prevent it, and it ought not to do so. So far as poverty is the result of selfish and unjust advantage taken by others, it will operate to prevent it, and it ought to.

And so the principle may be applied in all relations, leading to the conclusion that the result of the general application of this fundamental and comprehensive law of conduct will assist greatly to the amelioration and correction of whatever ills are the result of the application and practice of selfish principles, whether in the domestic circle, the social circle, in business, or in politics; hence it is unquestionably one of the most beneficent social precepts ever given to the race.

The fourth and vitalizing social principle in the Christian system is that enunciated in what is termed the second great commandment, "Thou

shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; that is, the principle of love for man as man.

This is named the vitalizing social principle, for the reason that it is the active personal factor that shapes the disposition and conduct of men into harmony with the fundamental principle of essential equality. In love is found the motive force that impels to friendly, helpful action, without waiting to deliberate upon just what exact justice might require; it goes much further and prompts to unselfish kindness to another, where self-interest would prompt an act centering in self; it promotes the type of activity that can result only in the improvement of the individual, and of society at large.

It is of vital importance that there be a proper conception of what love is as a social principle in the Christian system. Men are disposed to think of love only from the sentimental or emotional side. But it is conceived rightly, as a vital social principle when it is thought of as the "steadfast energy of the will," bent on the promotion of true fellowship and such social con-

ditions as are the necessary product of true fellowship. It was this type of love of which Jesus spoke.

Jesus saw in true fellowship the essential condition of true social welfare. Hence nothing must be allowed to disrupt fellowship; hence if one offends you, you must forgive him until "seventy times seven." This requirement to forgive has been viewed as purely a religious one; it is that, but it is more. It will be understood fully only when it is seen as an essential condition of maintaining uninterrupted fellowship as a primary factor in the highest social welfare, as love practically exemplified.

Jesus says also, "Love your enemies." At once this is thought of as a religious requirement, which it is. But it is as well a necessary condition of promoting and maintaining true social fellowship. Just what it is to love one's enemies, is explained by that other expression of Jesus, which is purely social, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. For in so

doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head," and thus thaw out his enmity.

That is, love for fellow-man is such an attitude of affection and will as is expressed in a fixed determination not to allow fellowship to be broken up, no matter what occurs. The principle is illustrated from another side by the parable of the Good Samaritan. There, love was expressed not in overflowing emotion, but in actually doing what was needed. That is, love, regard for fellow-man, no matter what his race, no matter what his position or condition; such regard for fellow-man as will result in fixed determination to extend help whenever and wherever help is needed;—this is the vitalizing principle set forth in the social teaching of Christianity, viewed from the human side.

This type of love expresses itself also in willing, friendly association with fellow-men on the basis, not of clique, or clan, or club, but on the basis of the common equality and common worth of all. Jesus was himself distinctively a society man; not a society man in the sense in which the

term is ordinarily used, but in the true and worthy sense of the term; a man that sought and loved the fellowship of fellow-men. He mingled with society whenever opportunity presented; at weddings, in the homes of the rich, in the homes of the poor, at the table of the ostracized publican, everywhere, till he was called a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners; but everywhere he met men on the plane of common equality. He craved friendship, and this led him to seek fellowship; he was a lover of men as men, and hence he was equally at home with men of all classes, because they were men. His heart went out in deep sympathy for the poor, who for any reason were not in the enjoyment of the blessings that God has provided for all. It was this intense sympathy for the poor that led him to say, "When you entertain, invite the poor, the crippled, the lame, the blind," a suggestion that has been taken seriously by but very few.

The heart of Jesus went out in pity for the rich, who, surrounded with the good things of

earth, looked with indifference, if not with contempt upon those who were not so highly favored, knowing that their situation, viewed from his standpoint, was fully as sad as that of the poor.

This, love for man as man, this is the vitalizing principle of the entire social economy presented by Jesus Christ. And is it not easily seen that to-day as then, the great social need, the one great need in order to the better adjustment of social relations and conditions, from whatever point the subject is viewed, is the actual presence of this same vitalizing principle of love for man as man, love that expresses itself in the steadfast will to promote true fellowship, and the conditions that true fellowship will produce.

This condition prevailing, the solution of the problems that so sorely vex society will not long wait solution. For to-day our social problems, whether commercial, industrial, political, or whatsoever they may be, are what they are because of the absence of proper regard for man as man. Viewed from another side, they are

what they are because of the constant clash of selfish interests, each seeking the defeat of the other with a view to the attainment of selfish ends.

Selfishness is the bane of society. That it is that impels to brutal practices in modern commercialism; that fosters great lines of business that fatten on the ruin of character and of the home; that impels employers to grind employes, and employes to seek to wreck and ruin employers.

And while improved legislation is needed, and of vital importance, yet never will these conditions be essentially changed till love for man as man takes the place of selfish greed as the controling principle in social conduct.

Only as men become possessed of the spirit of Christ will there be the recognition of the equal rights of all men, and only then will this love for man as man become vital in society. He is the Light; he is the Life: the light of this world; the life of this world. And if this world is to be made better, then he must be given his rightful

place in the lives of men, and then will there be the life, the love abundant; then will there be "peace on earth; goodwill toward men."

IV.

CAUSES OF POVERTY

IV.

CAUSES OF POVERTY

That the supplies of nature will continue to be sufficient to support increasing population is now generally accepted. In our own country we have thus far only begun to test our natural resources. And yet, two things very significant appear.

The first is that in this country, so youthful and so bountiful, there is already widespread and increasing poverty. There are said to be six millions of our people in a state of poverty, "living in dread of hunger, working sore and gaining nothing," which William Dean Howells pronounces "the essence of poverty." Besides there are said to be four millions of paupers, dependent upon the public for their support. Besides these there are many millions, who, though better situated, are by no means in a comfortable, much less an independent condition.

The second fact is that the number of poor in proportion to our population has been rapidly increasing during the last sixty years—the period in which we have made the most rapid progress in the accumulation of wealth.

What causes are operating in American society to produce such conditions?

This is an important question to every one interested in social betterment. It is especially important because its correct answer is necessary to effective remedial efforts. There is little hope of curing a disease until there has been a reasonably correct diagnosis.

If these causes are unavoidable, then we have nothing hopeful to look forward to in this relation. If they are voidable, or if any considerable part of them is voidable, then it is the duty of all who desire social amelioration, and especially the duty of the Christian church, to try to abate as far as possible these causes of distress.

One thing must be said in a negative way. That is, that the presence of poverty in our country cannot be attributed to a lack of natural re-

sources. And yet even here care must be exercised.

Natural resources are actual resources only when they are developed. In many respects the natural resources of our country were as great when it was occupied by the American Indian as they were after it was occupied by the white man. And yet the Indians lived in almost extreme poverty. These resources were quite as great when the country was occupied by the early white settlers as they are now. Yet very many of them lived in poverty in the very midst of these resources. Resources must be developed before they have value. Hence lack of knowledge of resources, or of how to develop them, or lack of occasion or disposition to develop them, may be occasion of poverty.

Closely related to these may stand the increase of our population from foreign countries, resulting in filling up our country more rapidly than its resources are discovered and developed, this resulting frequently in lack of employment, and consequent poverty.

There are also certain conditions or causes over which, so far as present knowledge and abilities extend, there is no control. Among these are unpreventable calamities of nature, wholly unavoidable disease and accident. It is encouraging that through scientific investigation and invention these causes are being rapidly reduced.

But more particularly, what are the individual and social causes of poverty?

Quite a number of what may be termed immediate or direct causes may be classed under the general head of disability or inability to do that which is necessary to produce what is needed to supply the necessities of life.

A normal condition of human life, viewed from this material side, would be a condition in which each person of mature years, at least each head of a family, should be capable of producing at least enough to provide for the needs of himself and those dependent upon him, plus enough to provide such necessities in case of ordinary sickness, and, after a reasonable period of labor

is completed. Such a man, capable of so providing, might be termed a normal man.

But it is clear that some men are not normal according to this standard. There are many who, because of lack of physical or intellectual ability, are not able to accomplish this task of adequate provision.

This disability may or may not be caused by the individual himself. He may have been born physically or intellectually defective. In such case, so far as the individual is concerned, his condition is an unavoidable cause of poverty. His disability may be because of lack of adequate preparation for an average life task. In that case, the responsibility may be with himself, with his parents, or with society because of not having provided adequate facilities for his training. The disability may be because of misconduct upon his own part. He may have induced it through drink or other debilitating habits or practices. In that case he is the cause of his own poverty.

There is a second general class of causes of poverty of a personal or individual character. These may be put under the general term, indifference. There is with many a lack of disposition to do the work necessary to producing what is needed, or a lack of disposition to conserve what has been produced.

It is not going wide of the truth to say that there are many men too indolent, too lazy, to do the work necessary to support either themselves or those dependent upon them; men who, as it is sometimes said, are always hunting for work, but seemingly always hopeful that they will not find it. Or if they find it, will work barely long enough to get money sufficient for a meal or a night's lodging, or a drink of liquor. From these men the army of tramps is recruited.

Under this same head of indifference to honest toil are to be classed men of criminal tendencies, who, rather than work will commit a crime, indifferent to sentence of court, if they are not even glad thus to get house and lodging at the expense of the public.

Under this same head of indifference is to be classed wastefulness; wastefulness either in not caring properly for the products of toil in the home, or in extravagant use of those products. The old adage is true, "Wilful waste makes woeful want." Also, "A woman can throw more out of the house with a teaspoon than a man can throw in with a scoop-shovel."

Many men waste for useless tobacco and for harmful liquor enough to provide many of the necessities of the home, and keep the wolf of poverty from the door. A large share of this waste is by men who receive small wages.

If we couple with these things needless extravagance in dress, even upon the part of many poor people, both men and women, and extravagance in furnishing the home by the way of the high-priced installment house and the pawn shop, it is easy to see why to many a home, poverty comes "as a robber, and want as an armed man."

It is argued that the poor man has as much right to some of the luxuries of life as has the

rich man. As a matter of abstract right, he has. But we are concerned here, not with the questions of abstract right, but with the very practical question of the causes of poverty. And extravagance and useless expenditure is one of them. Being charitable as one may in his estimate of men, we are compelled to admit that a large measure of the growing poverty of our country is the result of indifference upon the part of individuals to the conditions necessary to avoid it; and they only can abate these causes.

Dr. Edward T. Devine, Secretary of the Charity Organization of New York City, says that he discovered, as the result of scientific investigation in five thousand dependent families in New York City, that in sixteen and sixteen-hundredths per cent. of the families, the poverty was traceable to intemperance; in eleven and seven-tenths per cent. to laziness and shiftlessness; in five and twelve-hundredths per cent., to licentiousness; in three and eighty-eight hundredths per cent., to untruthfulness and unreliability; in thirty-seven and thirty-six-hun-

dredths per cent., to causes voidable only by the individual.

Doctor Devine and others raise the question whether these classes are poor because of their personal indifference, or whether they are indifferent, with resultant poverty, because of social economic conditions. Socialists claim the latter. And hence they trace all the resultant poverty back to society as its ultimate cause. There may be an element of truth in their position; but to account in this manner wholly for these conditions and the resultant evils, is to relieve the individual of all responsibility, and thus exempt him from all obligation, and thereby dig the grave of society, of which the individual is the ultimate unit. If there is no obligation upon the individual, whence can come obligation to society? There is great need of improved social conditions, as a means of abating poverty. But God save us from the day when, by relieving the individual of responsibility, we encourage personal indifference to the conditions that make for material as well as higher welfare.

Social economic conditions may be such as to deprive many men of what is needed to render home comfortable. But each man is himself responsible if, under these conditions, he by indolence, wastefulness, and useless expenditure, deprives the home of what it might have. His wife, too, is responsible if, under these conditions, she is wasteful of or extravagant with what they do have. It is the fundamental duty of every one, rich or poor, to use wisely what he does possess.

Light will be thrown upon this point by the following from the *Saturday Evening Post* under the topic, "Thrift Among the Rich," by Isaac F. Marcosson.

"Most persons will be surprised to learn that the very rich are apt to watch their daily expenses more sharply than does the man in more moderate circumstances.

"To show you the extent to which this is carried, let me cite a system created by one of the great captains of capital, and later developed and adapted to individual needs by more than

one important personage in Wall Street. It gives you a new and intimate glimpse into the economics of large personal expense, and shows that thrift does not vanish with the coming of millions.

"As a most significant performance the beginning of this system was interesting. A certain rich man found leakage in his expenses. It was difficult to find specific causes for seeming extravagance. He lost much valuable time fussing over invoices and bills. He was an organizer; so he decided to apply to personal expenditure the genius of detail he had injected into great industrial enterprises.

"He laid out a system of accounting that would tell him at a glance just what he was spending for, ranging from the cream on his breakfast table to the tips he gave when traveling. The original plan was put on a huge sheet that looked like the financial statement of a railroad. Later its salient features were reduced to more compact form by one of his friends, who changed the sheet to a folder about the size of a

railroad timetable. For the purpose of illustration, this folder will be described here.

"The pages of the folder are divided into narrow, ruled columns. These columns are grouped into sections and each section is devoted to some branch of expense. The man has a town house, a farm, and a garage. Therefore the main headings under which expenses are itemized are: House Expense, Table Expense, Stable, Automobile, Farm, Hotel (for he travels a great deal), and Sundries.

"As soon as a bill comes in the man stamps it with a rubber stamp; his clerk makes out a voucher for it, and the check, pinned to this voucher, comes back for signature. Checks are signed only twice a month, save for some pressing emergency.

"Any one of the sections in this system will show the minute detail with which rich men watch their affairs. Take the part devoted to house expense. Here you find columns for housemaids and housemen, laundry, renewals and supplies, light and heat, telephone. In the section

devoted to table expense you find columns for wages—cook and waitress, groceries and fruit, milk and cream, meat and fish, linen, china, and kitchen renewals.

"The sundry section is perhaps the most striking of all, for it is a marvel of detail. Absolutely nothing that can call for the expenditure of money escapes record. Things to which the average man, with no system of personal accounting, pays no attention, find minute reckoning here. Yet the average man's indifference to this very thing is one reason why he never escapes from the bondage of the pay envelope."

If rich men find it important to guard thus carefully their expenditures, how much more is extreme care necessary upon the part of men and women of limited means.

But, conceding all that may justly be said of individual responsibilty for poverty, what is to be said of social responsibility?

The fact that man is a social being renders necessary some form of social or political organization. But social organization means at least

some measure of social obligation. Just what is the extent of that obligation has been one of the social questions of the ages. But it is a question that must have some answer before any progress can be made toward answering the next question, How shall that obligation be met? Jesus Christ, the author of the Christian system, taught that that obligation will be met only when society is organized and operated upon the theory that every man is brother to every other man; that is, when society is organized and operated upon the theory that the essential rights of any man are the same as the essential rights of every other man.

It is hardly necessary to say that this type of social organization does not exist, or is not practically applied to-day. But if we accept this theory, or anything approaching it, as the true theory, then we must recognize it as obligatory upon society to create such conditions as shall, as nearly as possible, give to each one who is to become a member of society, adequate preparation for at least an average life task. This em-

braces very much. It means that under anything like reasonable conception of its obligations, society is responsible for the creation of such conditions as will, as far as possible, insure that every member of society shall be well born, well reared, and adequately qualified for an average life task.

Therefore, to the extent to which society has not sought, and is not seeking to create such conditions, to that extent society is and will be responsible for the poverty and distress that result from these neglects.

But further than this, it must appear clear to every one that, under any reasonable conception of its obligation, society is responsible for the creation, as nearly as possible, of such conditions as will guarantee to each member of society adequate and fair opportunity for the performance of the average life task. Some will hold that it should be equal opportunity. But equal opportunity can be provided only to those who are of equal capability and disposition. Every man is himself a part, indeed a large part,

of his own opportunity. Hence the best that can be asked, and the best that can be done by society, is to create conditions in which to each member of society there shall be guaranteed adequate and fair opportunity. And to the extent that society has not and is not doing this, to that extent society has been and is responsible for existent poverty.

How is it with us as a nation in these respects?

There is no question that we are increasing in wealth very rapidly. But in doing this we are employing eight millions of our women, and one million seven hundred thousand of our children in factories and stores, all of whom belong to the poorer classes. Unquestionably this means that many of our future citizens will be neither well born, well reared, nor well trained; thus we are enhancing poverty, and by no means abating it. These are conditions also that can be abated or ameliorated only by the action of society. In large parts of our country, too, we are not only tolerating but legalizing institu-

tions that promote intemperance and waste. The abolition of these conditions is a task that can be performed only by society. And so long as society does not do this, so long it is responsible, at least in part, for the resultant poverty.

But there is still another phase of this question of social responsibility.

At the same time that our wealth is increasing, our poverty is also increasing. And, while the increasing wealth is with accelerating rapidity gravitating into the hands of a few, the increasing poverty is becoming both more intense and more widespread. It is also true that the increase of poverty is chiefly among those known as the laboring classes.

Now, the increase of the volume of wealth is the result chiefly of the application of industry. Exchange effects transfer of wealth, but no increase. Articles have the same value before as after exchange; hence there is in this process no increase of values. Exchange may indirectly promote wealth by facilitating the application of industry, but it does not of itself create

wealth. Planning, effective organization, and superintendence promote effectiveness in the application of labor, and thus increase its product. But the increase of value is the result of industry applied to natural resources. Therefore the conclusion must be that the vast increase of our wealth as a nation is chiefly the result of the toil of men, women, and children engaged in our industries, our laboring population, this application being rendered possible and effective by men engaged in promoting these industries. But at the same time that this applied industry is adding to the volume of our wealth, both our poverty and the increase of our poverty prevail increasingly among those who labor, while the increase of our wealth passes largely into the hands of those for whom they labor.

Conceding for the argument that this accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few is legitimate according to present standards, the question must arise as to the righteousness of the standards. That is, knowing that the efficiency and therefore the productiveness of labor is

all the while increasing, while at the same time poverty is increasing among the laboring classes, we seem forced to one of two conclusions: either the laboring classes as a class are careless and thriftless, and successful employers as a class are careful and thrifty, a position that could not be successfully maintained; or, this increasing disparity of conditions is, in part at least, a result of inequitable division of the products of labor. It cannot be charged to the incompetency of the laboring classes, because their competency is an important contributing factor to, and therefore evidenced by the increase of wealth. The conclusion is that a very considerable part of increasing poverty is the result of inequitable division of the products of labor, and therefore that society is not guaranteeing to every man an adequate and fair opportunity for an average life task, and that therefore society is itself responsible for a share, perhaps a large share, of prevalent poverty.

The author is not a socialist. Much of the teaching and conclusions of socialism he cannot

endorse. But of one thing he is convinced; that is, that much that they and others outside their ranks claim as to unrighteous attitudes toward the producing classes is true. And hence, that to the extent that society endorses and tolerates those attitudes, to that extent society is itself responsible for present and increasing poverty.

After there has been laid at the door of the poor all the blame that justly attaches to them, if justice is done, a large share of blame for poverty must be laid at the door of those who "oppress the hireling in his wages." And, it is the duty, as it is the right, of society to effect an equitable adjustment in these relations, to the end that justice shall be done between man and man, and that righteousness may be the watchword of the nation.

What, then, are the causes of poverty?

Certain conditions that, as far as we can see, are unavoidable by either the individual or by society.

Certain personal conditions or characteristics that are voidable only by the individual.

Certain conditions that exist by consent or authority of society, and are voidable only by society.

One thing, however, all can clearly see is, that these voidable conditions, whether by the individual or by society, have their origin or basis in defective moral conceptions and attitudes. Selfishness is a moral defect; dishonesty, greed, inhumanity, indolence, wastefulness, and all the related manifestations are the expressions of moral defect. Hence the effective removal of those causes of poverty that are the product of these or of any of them, awaits the development of higher moral conceptions and attitudes in both the individual and in society.

Here appears in an important sense the social mission of Christianity, and the social task of the church the agency for the promotion of Christianity. The church must both teach and exemplify the social teachings of the gospel. It must labor to secure the general and practical application of the gospel of Christ; to awaken in men and women higher moral conceptions and

win them to higher moral attitudes; to win them above all things else to a personal acceptance of Jesus Christ, that by the vitalizing power of his own life and Spirit they may be rendered capable of attaining to higher attitudes in personal living and in social conduct. This is fundamental work. Without it, legislation, instruction can accomplish but little.

It is an immense task; but it is the task that the church must perform before there can ever come the social regeneration that the welfare of the race demands.

V.

THE ABATEMENT OF POVERTY

V.

THE ABATEMENT OF POVERTY

THIS is a large subject. Only what seem to be some fundamental conditions can be presented, and these chiefly in outline.

Under "Causes of Poverty," the following were named:

Certain conditions in nature that, so far as can now be seen, are not wholly voidable either by society or by the individual.

Certain personal conditions that are voidable only by the individual.

Certain conditions that exist by the authority or consent of society, and are avoidable only by society.

It will be readily conceded that if this diagnosis of causes is correct, then any effective effort to abate poverty must relate to the removal of either natural, personal, or social causes.

As to natural causes, unpreventable calamities, unavoidable disease and accident, it is not

probable that they will ever be wholly removed. But that much more will be done toward their removal or modification than has been done, there is no reason to question. Progress in medical science in the past fifty years, and especially the many recent discoveries in that field, seem to justify the hope that in the not distant future there will be little of what may be termed really unavoidable disease, provided society will be wise enough to require, and when necessary, compel the application and use of the accredited results of medical achievement.

Scientific investigation and invention in other fields have accomplished so much that we are justified in hoping that in the near future the destructiveness of natural calamities and the range of unavoidable accidents will be greatly reduced, if society will do its duty in applying the results of investigation and invention.

Scientific investigation and invention will contribute largely also to the reduction of poverty by means of a more effective development of natural resources. Recent achievements in pro-

moting increased productiveness of the soil, in the improvement of natural products, and the prevention of mineral waste, are but promises of the greater things yet to be accomplished in the direction of development, and in the opening of new lines of production and industry.

Passing to the consideration of personal causes, whether they be classed under the general head of disability, physical or intellectual; or under the head of indifference, embracing indolence, criminality, and wastefulness; it must be clear to any one that thinks carefully, that in very large part these causes have their basis in defective moral conditions; that is, in failure somewhere, either in the individual, or in his parents or ancestors, or in society at large, to recognize and discharge some of the obligations of man to man. Some of these conditions are being recognized as directly the result of physical defects in the individual. Those will be cared for through proper surgical or medical attention.

When we pause to consider social causes, whether in the failure of society to create con-

ditions such that its every member will be well born, well reared, and well trained; or whether in the failure of society to secure to its every member, as far as possible, adequate and fair opportunity, these failures of society also have their basis ultimately in defective moral conditions—that is, in failure of society to recognize and discharge some of the obligations which society owes to men individually, or to itself.

Whatever may be the cause of these defective moral conditions, and whatever may be necessary to their correction, it must be seen first of all that primarily they lie at the basis of practically all poverty that is not the result of natural causes. The extreme poverty in China is not the result simply of her immense population, but largely the result of her superstitions that have prevented anything like an adequate development of her natural resources. And superstition is a moral defect.

That is, conceding that natural resources if discovered and utilized are ample, if throughout the history of the race each man and each woman

had been morally normal, recognizing and discharging all obligations to fellow-man, and if, as a consequence, society had always been morally normal, then poverty as the result of personal and social causes would not exist. Hence its permanent abatement awaits the creation of normal moral conditions.

It may be objected that the meeting of moral obligation would not guarantee physical and intellectual ability. But this is largely a mistake. Most, if not all, congenital physical defects, as well as most if not all of congenital mental imbecility, has its origin in the violation of moral obligation somewhere. Besides, the recognition and discharge of moral obligations upon the part of the individual and of society would result in providing adequate means, facilities, and conditions for such universal intellectual and physical training as would prepare men adequately for their life task.

The point made is, that the fundamental need in order to the effective and permanent solution of this problem of poverty is not, as some hold,

a *political* need, nor a *social* need properly speaking, but a *moral* need. This need may be named a universal, moral regeneration. The man or the woman that is lazy, that induces physical or intellectual disability by evil habits, that is criminal, that is wasteful or extravagant, has low moral conceptions, and the fundamental need, in order to the abatement of the poverty that results, is the elevation of all such to higher moral standards.

And when society permits conditions that necessarily entail ill breeding with consequent physical or intellectual debilitation; when it authorizes or tolerates institutions that promote drunkenness and licentiousness; when it fails to provide and require attendance upon adequate facilities for preparation for life; when it authorizes or tolerates conditions that deny to people adequate and fair opportunities; when it tolerates conditions that deny adequate compensation for labor or impose unjust prices in trade—when such conditions exist, then society is controlled by low ideals, and the primary need

is to elevate to higher moral conceptions those members of society who practice and impose these injustices. In other words, there is no possibility of a general and permanent elevation of economic conditions except as there is first developed an elevated standard of moral ideas and practices. The great need in order to permanent removal of poverty is not more money in the pockets of the people, but more genuine manhood in their lives.

"God, give us men; a time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and
ready hands."

This is a fundamental economic need as well as a fundamental patriotic need, and it will be supplied only by the elevation of moral conceptions.

But it will be said that, even conceding all this, the process is too slow; it will require too much time. We must have more immediate help. Hence the feeling that we must try to do mechanically and therefore temporarily by legal enactment what ought to be wrought perma-

nently by moral forces, and must be if permanent results are to be attained.

There is need, and there is possibility of a measure of relief, in the mechanical way; but only to the measure that the average moral sentiment is high enough to establish and enforce the legal measures necessary to compel obedience upon the part of those who are controlled by selfish motives. Beyond that point there is no possibility of relief by legal or other mechanical measures.

It will be recognized that as we move in this direction of mechanical effort we are liable to move also toward some scheme of social control; this, however, does not necessarily imply either so-called political socialism, or the minifying of individual obligation; but it does mean that individual effort for the abatement of poverty shall be encouraged, and if need be that the individual shall be compelled by society to act in conformity with generally accredited ideas relative to economic welfare.

What then may, and what should society do looking to the abatement of poverty?

It is evident that whatever society does must be done under one of two general heads. That is the action of society looking toward the abatement of poverty must be directed either toward limiting or directing individual action relative to economic conditions; or, toward the limiting or directing of the actions of organizations or of society relative to economic conditions. It may operate in either or both of these relations.

This last statement suggests several great questions that have risen, especially under the various forms of democratic political organization. Some of these questions are, "What is the true limit to individual activity?" "How far may society proceed to substitute the judgment, will, methods, and activity of society for the judgment, will, methods, and activity of the individual, and compel the individual to submit to such substitution?"

These are general questions, the discussion of which cannot be entered upon here, further than

to express a few thoughts that may bear upon them, which relate also to the subject under immediate consideration.

It would seem reasonable to say that, along with the right to encourage everything that will promote general moral uplift, society has also the right to emphasize and encourage the recognition of and compliance with essential economic conditions, and in some relations to compel compliance with them.

It might be too much to say that society has the right to forbid and punish habits of extravagance and waste. But it should at least provide instruction that will encourage care and economy.

It certainly is not too much to say that society has the right to compel those that are indolent and criminal, and addicted to drunkenness and vice, to submit to conditions under which it would be necessary for them to perform labor adequate to the support of themselves and of those dependent upon them. Such persons should be compelled to labor under healthful and ele-

vating conditions for a reasonable wage, the excess of which above the cost of their support, should be turned over to those who are dependent upon them, or related to them, or, kept for their own use after they shall have acquired habits of industry, integrity, and frugality. The present practice of confining men in prison and farming out their labor to heartless exploiters for almost nothing, with no regard for those dependent upon them, and without regard to their own future, is a relic of barbarism, and a disgrace to modern intelligence and philanthropy.

Society has also the right and is in duty bound, in the interest of improved economic conditions, to abate the saloon, the gambling den, and the brothel, for the reason that they are not only breeders of disease and vice, but also because they are two of the prime causes of poverty, and neither of them in themselves of any value to society. Wherever society fails to abate them, these institutions stand as a public and emphatic evidence of the low moral conceptions

and purposes of the state or the nation that tolerates them.

Chaplain Shallby, formerly of the Boys' Industrial Home at Lancaster, Ohio, where more than five hundred boys were confined, says that about ninety-five per cent. of them were there because either their fathers or their mothers were addicted to drink. The tax payers of Ohio have put more than a million and a half dollars into permanent improvements for this institution, besides what is required yearly for its current maintenance. Besides this, there is the awful impoverishment of the homes from which these boys come. At the same time the State of Ohio tolerates and authorizes the continuance of the brewery, the distillery, and the saloon, which are responsible for at least half the drinking and drunkenness that causes these conditions. This is indeed "saving at the spigot and wasting at the bunghole."

Society has also the right to place such restrictions on immigration as is necessary to prevent both her moral decline, and the impoverish-

ment of her people by increasing population beyond ability to provide adequate support, and should do so.

Society has the right to go further than has been expressed. It has the right, and is in duty bound, so to govern and control general industrial and commercial institutions as to guarantee to the largest possible degree to every one an adequate and a fair opportunity for his life task.

So far as known, there has never yet been presented evidence sufficient to prove that any system of mechanical equalization of possessions or of wealth will accomplish anything permanent in the way of the abatement of poverty. Nor has there yet been proof beyond theoretic statements that the complete socialization of industry and commerce will bring permanent relief from poverty.

This is very far, however, from saying that nothing can be done by society, or that society has no duty to perform in relation to the commerce and industries of the country with a view to curbing and removing the causes that produce

poverty. The fact that during the past fifty years the developed wealth of this country has been gravitating with alarming rapidity away from the producing to the managing classes, and the consequent growing poverty among the producing classes, along with other conditions in both industry and commerce, indicates that there is injustice in prevailing conditions, and as well demonstrates that without the direct aid of society the toiling masses are unable to secure and husband that which is justly theirs.

Something has been accomplished at correcting these evils by organization upon the part of the laboring classes; this should be highly appreciated; but the relief has not been and cannot be adequate. One result of prevailing conditions of injustice and of inadequate relief, has been the awakening of a spirit of revenge bordering on desperation, and expressing itself in strikes, riots, and dynamiting. Such practices are unlawful, and must be suppressed; but as well the unwarranted conditions that provoke this spirit must be changed. For, so long as the

producing causes exist, so long will these and similar consequences ensue. If these consequences are to be abolished, there must be discovered and applied means for the abolishing of the producing causes. That is, there must be discovered and applied a method by which society shall compel unwilling employers to divide to the full measure of justice with those who by their toil actually produce the increase of wealth. Or, expressing it otherwise, society must reach a method by which to stop the awful drainage of the produced wealth of the country from the hands of the many into the hands of the few, and thus correct the conditions that now prevail, when seventy and five-tenths per cent. of the wealth of our country is owned by nine-tenths of one per cent. of the people of our country.

Unless and until this is done, and the consequent inevitable poverty resultant therefrom abated, the laboring population will continue to protest; and the indications are that unless this is done and done speedily, they will compel its doing by measures that may threaten death to

private industry and enterprise, a calamity too great to be borne by this or any nation.

The refusal of business men in the days of Amos to do justice, and the failure of Judah and Israel to compel such justice, brought poverty to the great body of the Jews, and brought the curse of God upon the kingdoms, and was one of the causes that led to their overthrow. God Almighty is just as determined that justice shall be done to-day as he was then. He sees to-day, as clearly as he saw then, the injustice and the danger of conditions that result in the congestion of wealth in the hands of a few, and in the consequent robbery of millions who have thus been deprived of what was justly theirs; and he says to-day as he said then, "Cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow."

Society must just as truly and effectively control those who for their selfish gratification seek to incite strikes, and riots, and revolution. It is true that injustice is practiced on many of the toiling masses; but it is just as certainly true

that many laboring men disregard the rights of employers, and of choice contribute to the promotion of unrest and disquiet.

Just how society shall proceed to correct these evils, whether in part by the minimum wage plan, or through public supervision and control of public and semi-public industries, or by some combination of these or other plans, it will take time to demonstrate. But if poverty is to be to any reasonable degree abated or even checked, some plan must be reached whereby the laboring man shall have either directly or indirectly, a voice in determining how the fruits of his toil shall be divided; a voice adequate to guaranteeing him justice in the common race of life; and the employer as well guaranteed against the loss imposed by conscienceless and anarchical laboring men.

But the solution of the problem of poverty from the side of society means not only the securing of justice in remuneration, but it means as well the securing of protection against exploitation in trade.

It would be unwise to institute any system that would remove the impulse to individual initiative. But it is also destructively unjust to tolerate a system or a condition in which commercial or professional interests are protected in the practice of legal robbery to the impoverishment of the people, or to depriving them of necessary physical nourishment and protection.

The present and increasing high cost of living unites with the recent successful prosecution of great corporations to prove that, whatever other conditions may be responsible, yet the poor are being robbed by great commercial enterprises at the same time that they are being stinted by industrial injustice. And, they are equally helpless in each case. If poverty is to be abated the rapacity of selfish tradesmen as well as the greed of heartless employers must be checked and abolished.

It is said that the trouble is not so much the high cost of living, as the cost of high living. There may be an element of truth in this. But there are certain elements of nutriment and of

clothing essential to health and vigor; and the price of even these elements is to-day quite as much under the artificial control of selfish greed as is the price of elements that border on the luxuries. These conditions render it imperative for society to interfere and provide for the supervision of trade as well as of industry. The same principles require that society shall, with increasing care and vigor, control the great agencies of transportation and communication. Recent sugar, insurance, and railroad scandals, ferreted out and proved before the highest courts of the nation, are ample proof of all these needs.

How then shall poverty be abated?

Remedial measures looking to this end must be adopted and put into effect by society, looking to improved physical and intellectual equipment and qualification; looking as well to the abolition of drunkenness and drunkard making; looking to the abolition of racial degeneration by any and all of the social vices; the brewery, the distillery, the saloon, the brothel, the gambling den, must all go. There must also be better provi-

sion looking to effective preparation for life work.

Along with this society must so control both the productive and commercial industries and institutions as that justice shall be done to all, thus providing at least a fair opportunity to all.

But back of all this, and as the fundamental condition of it all, there must come general moral uplift, until men and women shall choose to be industrious, sober, clean, and thrifty; until captains of industry, and masters of commerce, and laboring men, shall love justice and do it, and shall hate iniquity and avoid it.

But moral uplift comes only through the quickening of conscience, and this only through a clearer knowledge and recognition of obligation to God and to man, and finally through the quickening power of the Spirit of God in the life of the individual and in society.

Here then we are forced to the conclusion that at its very basis, the solution of this poverty rests, not upon the politician; not upon the social worker as such; not upon the philanthro-

pist; not upon legal mechanics; but distinctively upon the church of Jesus Christ, the agency for promoting the Christian system. The church must arouse. Hence it is that the editor of the *Wall Street Journal,* the great commercial paper, said editorially a few years ago, that the great need of our country, viewed from the economic side is a revival; a revival of genuine righteousness. It is but the repetition of the need as Jehovah saw it, when he said by the lips of the prophet Amos,

"Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

The church is the only institution that accepts as its distinct obligation and mission the quickening of the conscience, the elevation of moral standards, the regeneration of the individual, and through him the regeneration of society.

Hence the church must be brought to the clearer recognition of her duty to society, and must be brought to bend her energies more effectively to the discharge of that mission, until

her "righteousness shall go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a lamp that burneth."

VI.

THE PROBLEM OF DIVORCE

VI.

THE PROBLEM OF DIVORCE

THERE is a problem of divorce, an exceedingly complex problem; a social problem, upon the satisfactory and effective solution of which depends to a very large degree the attainment of true social welfare.

What solution of this problem does the Christian system propose?

The answer can be reached only by way of a careful consideration of the problem itself.

However vexing the question of divorce is today, it is helpful to know that it is not wholly a question of modern times. It was a vexing question in the days of Jesus Christ, and had been for centuries.

The Old Testament or Jewish law of divorce, or of legal separation of husband and wife is (Duet. 21:1, 2), "When a man taketh a wife and marrieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly thing in her, that he shall write her a bill

of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife." It is clear that this is a very liberal law, allowing legal separation upon the simple ground that the wife "finds no favor in his eyes, because he hath found something unseemly in her." Neither does it require any court proceedings, but simply the giving of a written "bill of divorcement." This gave wide room for diversity of interpretation, the result of which was a divided mind among the Jews, one section holding with Rabbi Schammai that divorce was allowable only in case of moral transgression, which as some say was limited to unchastity. Another section held with Rabbi Hillel who gave the law a much more liberal interpretation.

The result was a great laxity of the marriage relation, the husband being allowed to repudiate his wife for any reason that rendered her distasteful to him, even for the trivial offense of spoiling his dinner. It is to be noticed also that

the right to give divorce belonged only to the husband. The wife might make no reply, nor might she sever her connection with her husband, no matter how much he might lack favor in her eyes. The Jews had a problem of divorce.

Conditions were still worse among the Romans. Emperor Augustus tried to check this source of ruin to the family by enacting stricter laws, but without avail. Septimus Severus made a special effort to check the growing profligacy and demoralization of the family, but public morals were on too low a plain, and the effort failed. Rome, too, had a problem of divorce.

The inauguration and spread of Christianity led to a better condition of morals, contributing largely to the re-establishing of the sanctity of the marriage relation and of the home, thus giving hope of an entirely new order. But there has come in more modern times such a marked change, such an increase of divorce, especially in our own country, as to raise the question, What is wrong, and what can be done to check this growing evil? Indeed so startling have con-

ditions become in this relation that they have already created alarm lest the very foundations of the family and the home be entirely swept away.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright, late United States Commissioner of Labor, is authority for the statement that in the United States the number of divorces increased from 9,937 in 1887 to 72,062 in 1906—that is, while during that period of twenty years the population of the United States increased ninety-seven per cent., divorce increase seven hundred and twenty-five per cent., or nearly seven and one-half times as fast as population increased. An eminent authority estimates that if divorce continues to increase at this rate, by the year 2000, fifty-eight and eight-tenths per cent. of all marriages will be terminated by divorce. Hon. Carroll D. Wright says that the situation as to divorce in the United States is unparalleled in any other country. Very surely there is a divorce problem in the United States.

How does the Christian system propose to deal with this problem?

In view of the fact that the United States of America is admitted to be the field of the most aggressive type of Christianity, and also the field presenting largest increase in divorce, this question seems quite difficult to answer.

Since these two facts co-exist, it might readily be concluded that Christianity is itself the cause of increasing divorce, and that therefore the most practical way in which to diminish divorce would be to diminish or discontinue entirely Christian activity. Viewed superficially, this answer would seem to be entirely logical. Indeed there may be a sense in which the aggressive promulgation of the Christian system is the occasion of the increasing divorce, a conclusion it is difficult to evade, in view of the fact that in this country where exists the most aggressive type of Christianity, there is also the largest increase in divorce.

But if Christianity is the true social as well as the true religious system, and even if it be found true that its promulgation is in some sense the occasion of increasing divorce, then

there must be somewhere a fallacy in the argument by which it should be concluded that the shortest route to the diminishing of divorce is to discontinue Christian activity. Where is that fallacy?

It will probably be found in the very common conception that the increase of divorce is in itself inherently an evil, instead of regarding it as a symptom of greater evils lying back, and which themselves cause increasing divorce. Some who look upon increase of divorce as wholly an evil, charge its prevalence and rapid increase to lax laws relative to marriage and to still laxer laws relative to divorce itself. It is quite possible that this conclusion has some basis, indeed a very important basis in fact.

Statistics are not complete enough to justify a definite conclusion. The Roman Catholic Church adheres strictly to its interpretation of the New Testament law of divorce, denying the right to such an absolving of the marriage relation as will allow remarriage. To substantiate her claim that her position is right, she cites the

fact that while in other than Catholic families there was, during a certain period, one divorce to each 442 couples, in Catholic families there was only one divorce to each 1766 couples.

It is interesting to note, however, that among the more fully Americanized Jews, who have no such rigid rule as the Catholics have, divorce is not nearly as frequent as among Gentiles other than Catholics. This seems to contradict the claim that simple laxity of legal enactment is the cause of increasing divorce.

It is probable, however, that lax divorce laws are to some degree, it may be to considerable degree, the occasion of frequent divorce. In the United States there are at least forty-two grounds upon which divorce can be secured, as shown by the varying divorce laws of the different States of the Union. Some of these grounds are remarkably trivial. It is stated upon good authority that in one of our States a divorce was secured because the husband staid out from home till ten o'clock at night; in another because the husband did not wash before coming home from

work. Such laws are a disgrace to Christian civilization.

Divorce should be made more difficult. Hon. Carroll D. Wright suggests in this relation four courses of procedure, as a means of diminishing divorce:

1. Where crime is alleged as a plea for divorce, let the alleged criminal be indicted and tried before a criminal court, and punishment other than divorce be imposed.

2. Make the State a party to divorce suits, so that both applicant and defendant can be examined and cross-examined in the interest of the State.

3. Make re-marriage more difficult.

4. Joint action by State legislatures. Here is shown great difficulty growing out of diversity of laws.

He also suggests the following legislation to prevent ill-advised marriages:

1. Publication of banns.

2. Punishment for reckless marriage.

3. Publication in marriage license of facts recited by applicants.

It would certainly be a great step in advance in this relation if the Congress of the United States would enact a reasonable marriage and divorce law, that shall be applicable in all States of the Union.

But conceding all this, it still remains a question whether by this means divorce would be largely and permanently eliminated, and this for the reason that divorce is more a symptom of evil than an evil itself. That is, the permament remedy for divorce is the removal of the evils that cause appeal to divorce as a means of escape from what are *considered* greater evils.

It needs to be noticed that Jesus himself did not forbid divorce absolutely, and in not doing so he said practically that there is one thing worse than the separation of husband and wife, that is, infidelity to the marriage vow. His language in relation to divorce is not mandatory; he simply points the consequences that follow where it exists, except for the one cause.

From this it seems reasonable to conclude that Jesus would teach that evils attendant upon a violation of the marriage relation are not to be remedied by simple legal enactment. There must be something that strikes deeper than this external symptom. In other words, divorce if in any sense tolerated by Jesus Christ, is tolerated upon the same grounds that it was tolerated and authorized by Moses, because of the hardness or wickedness of men's hearts; because of the evils that lie back of and give occasion to this more manifest evil.

This leads to the question, What is the cause of the increase of divorce?

God made man male and female, and intended them, upon the consummation of marriage to be one flesh. But now we find men and women who have been joined in holy wedlock, for one or another of more than forty reasons trying to sever the bonds that were intended to hold them together "till death do us part."

Why is it?

An historic view is necessary. Without question, marriage and the family are of divine authority. But sin has wrought havoc in the relation of the sexes as well as in every other relation. Whatever may have been man's original condition, history finds him in process of development from the plane of barbarism and savagery. In that condition woman has been invariably the sufferer. As Hon. Carroll Wright tells us, "The facts all show us that, however dissimilar the countries or the epochs, the union of man and woman begin, with very rare exceptions, by the complete slavery of the latter, and her assimilation to the condition of the domestic animals, over which man has all possible rights, and which he may drive away at will."

This is, in part, a picture of primitive conditions among the Jewish people as given in the Bible, among whom poligamy existed to a considerable extent; by whom wives were secured as a matter of barter and sale, as was exemplified by the manner in which Jacob secured his two wives. Even as late as the period of the

Judges, in connection with the incident of the slaughter of the Benjamites and the capture of the daughters of surrounding tribes for wives, we see a remarkably close approach to the conditions that prevailed among the surrounding pagan people, as illustrated by the story of the rape of the Sabines in Roman history.

But as the ages moved on, there was progress from these aboriginal conditions to where the wife occupied a higher plane, and yet but little above a slave or a domestic animal. A man could kill his wife if she displeased him; then he could simply repudiate her and drive her away; then this privilege of absolute dismissal was restricted, and woman was conceded some initial rights of her own; later to the Jewish women was conceded the right to "put away her husband," not mentioned in the Old Testament, but indicated by Jesus, Mark 10:12.

The history of progress in the matter of liberation of woman reveals much of tragedy. In some countries even claiming civilization, she is yet but little more than the menial servant of

man. In England she is still denied the right of petition for divorce. Progress in the direction of her liberation has been much greater in the United States, and yet it is easily within the memory of many now living that she was not considered the intellectual equal of men, as was evidenced only a few years ago by many American colleges prescribing a special course for females, they not being considered capable of doing the intellectual work prescribed for males.

To-day in the United States in the matter of obtaining divorce, woman stands upon a practical equality with man. In this progress towards fuller recognition of woman's equality with man, a progress that has been very rapid during the past hundred years especially in America, is to be seen without question at least occasion of the rapid increase of divorce. This is quite clearly evidenced by the increasing number of suits for divorce brought by wives. In the year ending June 30, 1908, in the State of Ohio there were almost three times as many suits for divorce brought by wives as by husbands. Dur-

ing the period 1871—1908, in the same State, there were almost three times as many divorces granted to wives as to husbands.

It thus becomes clear that under the Christian dispensation, especially since the Reformation, and most especially since the establishment of free institutions in America, civil and religious, there has been a gradual, and in the last half century a very rapid emancipation of woman. In America, and in all the really enlightened nations, woman is no longer the slave or even the subordinate of man, but she is his equal.

In our own country, where divorce has increased more rapidly than in any other, woman is more fuly emancipated from abject subjection to man than in any other. It is also true that here she is more honored, more respected, and more thoroughly protected than elsewhere. It is also true that in no country is she happier than here; nor is there any country where she is so independent of man as she is in this country —and all this is the result of her larger emancipation here.

Is it not reasonable, therefore, to conclude that in the emancipation of woman is an explanation, at least in part, of the growing prevalence of divorce. Woman, who throughout the ages has suffered the ills that have been imposed upon her with no opportunity for relief or redress, has come to the position where she is no longer under the necessity of submitting to such enormities as practiced in the past, and believing that divorce and separation are evils of less magnitude than abject submission, she claims her rights, and sues for liberation. This by no means accounts for all divorces; not even for all divorce petitions by women; neither is it intended to explain or excuse divorce for trivial or "affinitive" reasons. But it certainly does account for a large measure of the increase.

And further, since the emancipation of woman, the elevation of woman to a position of practical equality with man, is a result of the promulgation and application of the principles of Christianity, it may very justly be said that the spread of Christianity is itself, indirectly, an

occasion, not the cause, of the increase of divorce. Following this line of reasoning it might seem logical to conclude that a remedy for divorce would be to cease the promulgation of Christianity, and allow woman to be reduced back to her former condition of servitude. This answer might seem correct if divorce were not, as it very often is, an avenue of escape from more remote evils.

But if divorce is, as it very largely is, a symptom of evils more deeply seated; if lax marriage laws and divorce laws are themselves, as they are very generally, the result of low moral conceptions, then the real remedy for divorce, whether symptom or evil in itself, is the creation of a moral condition that will elevate marriage to its proper position, will guarantee to woman the respect due her in the marriage relation, and will render possible the enactment and enforcement of marriage and divorce laws such as the interests of society demand; that will not only secure to woman the recognition of her equality to, and equal rights with man before the law,

but a moral condition such as will secure and guarantee to both man and woman such character and such disposition as will make marriage what God intended and the interests of society demand that it shall be—a state of mutual affection, mutual respect, and mutual forbearance, in which husbands and wives shall universally live together in the harmony necessary for the effective maintenance of the home, and the proper rearing and development of the family.

Here, then, is the solution of the divorce problem under the Christian system. Not in the stopping of Christian activity, but in promulgating its teaching, its spirit, its life, with increasing aggressiveness, and with increasing regard for the welfare of the individual, the family, and of society at large.

Better homes wait for better husbands and wives. Better families await the presence of better fathers and better mothers. Diminished divorce, the abolition of divorce, awaits—yes, the enactment and enforcement of better laws; but more than all, the elevation of manhood, the

elevation of womanhood to the plane where the evils of passion, the evils of drunkenness, the evils of brutality, the evils of inhumanity and injustice, the evils that impel to divorce are themselves abolished, and love, true, conjugal love shall reign supreme in the domestic circle.

To accomplish this is, at least in part, the mission of the Christian system, and to the measure that Christianity accomplishes this task, to that extent will it solve effectively the problem of divorce.

VII.

THE PROBLEM OF VICE AND CRIME

VII.

THE PROBLEM OF VICE AND CRIME

HOSEA, who lived 750 B. C., in describing conditions in Israel at that time said, "There is no truth, nor goodness, nor knowledge of God in the land. There is nothing but swearing and breaking of faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing of adultery; they break out and blood toucheth blood."

It is an awful picture of moral depravity, and of the consequent reign of vice and crime, and of the corruption and destitution which they produce. The student of Old Testament history has little reason to question the accuracy of this description.

Isaiah, who lived about the same time, not discouraged with the sad condition, with the vision of the seer, apprehended the possibility and the approach of better conditions. Looking down the vista of the coming centuries he saw a period when, speaking in his highly figurative language, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb,

and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea."

These pictures serve several important purposes. They show that vice and crime are by no means of modern origin. They show that if human society is to be rid of these conditions of corruption and shame, and brought into a condition of general and stable peace, it will be accomplished through the universalizing of the knowledge of Jehovah.

Very surely society has not yet, at any point, attained the high ideal set forth in the language of Isaiah; but just as surely it is not in the condition depicted by Hosea; there are many encouraging evidences that progress is making toward's Isaiah's ideal.

How are communities, states, nations, the race, to be brought to this high ideal where "nothing shall hurt nor destroy," but where peace, quiet, happiness shall be the common heritage?

It is a large question and deserves a larger, fuller answer than limits here will permit.

Without question, there is a problem of vice and crime. What is its solution?

The Century dictionary defines vice as, "An immoral or evil habit or practice; evil conduct in which a person indulges; a particular form of wickedness or depravity; immorality; especially the indulgence of impure or degrading appetites or passions; as the vice of drunkenness."

Webster defines crime as a "violation of law, divine or human."

According to Webster's definition, vice and crime are almost if not quite synonymous terms. For every vice is a violation of divine law, and is therefore a crime. Ordinarily, however, crime is viewed as violation of human law, while vice is wrongdoing that does not rise to the plane of

violation of law. But even under this definition many vices are also crimes, for many vices are violations of human law.

The problem of vice, that is, How to diminish and ultimately abolish vice? is important for several reasons:

Vice tends to physical debilitation.

It tends to deprave morals, both public and individual.

It tends to the promotion of crime, and thus to the destruction of the social fabric.

The problem of crime is equally important for the same reasons, and especially because crime prevents the well-being and development of society. The problem of the elimination of the two evils may very well, therefore, be discussed as one.

Dr. Washington Gladden says that the most prevalent forms of social vice are, the social evil, gambling, and drunkenness. Dr. Carroll D. Wright says that probably the most gigantic evils which society has to deal with are those which come from licentiousness, or the social

evil. Next to this he says is intemperance or drunkenness. Next to this may be placed the vice or crime of gambling. These may well be said to be mother vices, whose progeny of evil is innumerable.

To name and classify crimes would necessitate a study of the criminal legislation of the nations. It is sufficient to say that in addition to the vices already named—which, in more highly civilized society are rapidly being catalogued as crimes—the more flagrant crimes are theft, burglary, fraud, Sabbath breaking, murder, and the various related violations of human rights.

Are vice and crime increasing or decreasing in civilized countries?

Since vice, especially vice that has not been publicly stamped as crime, is a personal matter, and therefore receives little or no public official recognition, it is quite impossible to give an intelligent answer in relation to it. Probably the only conclusion that can be reached is to be drawn from a comparison of conditions in civil-

ized with conditions in uncivilized or semi-civilized lands.

Viewed at least from the Christian standpoint, very certainly the Jews in Palestine in the time of Hosea and Isaiah represented the highest type of civilization then known to the race. If the picture drawn by Hosea of conditions at that time is to be taken as correct, then very certainly conditions as to vice and crime have greatly improved between that period and this.

Speaking of the social evil, while conditions in Christian nations are deplorably bad, yet they do not approach conditions in pagan lands, where, as it was in Rome and Greece, chastity was a disgrace rather than a virtue, and prostitution was consecrated as a religious rite. While we do not approach conditions of this character, yet we have great reason to blush because of the prevalence of this awful blight upon our civilization. Mrs. Ballington Booth said a few years ago that there were two hundred and twenty thousand fallen women in the United

States, and Dr. B. F. DeCosta says that for every fallen woman there are five fallen men. Gambling, too, in Christian lands is a blasting mildew, but it seems to be vastly more rife and destructive in pagan lands.

As to drinking and drunkenness, statistics are not very reassuring. They show that in 1860 the average consumption of alcoholic liquors was 4.17 gallons per capita; now it is something over twenty-three gallons. It is to be noted, however, that this increase has been almost altogether in malt liquors, there having been but little increase in the consumption of wine, and a decrease per capita in the consumption of distilled liquors. Since malt liquors are by far less intoxicating than distilled or vinous, the figures do not necessarily argue an increase in drunkenness in proportion to population.

In determining the increase of crime there is considerable difficulty, arising from several facts:

1. The scarcity of full and accurate statistics.

2. The variation and complexity of laws in relation to crime, some States defining as crime, what is not so recognized by other States.

3. The general tendency to increase the list of crimes by defining as crimes acts that have heretofore been classed as vices.

In view of the last two facts especially, it is difficult to reach an intelligent conclusion even in the presence of statistics.

Speaking as to suicide—if it may be classed as a crime—Dr. Edward T. Devine, of Columbia University, says, "The most obvious fact about the suicidal mania is its extraordinary increase in nearly all civilized countries—the rate of suicide having increased while the general mortality rate has gone down."

The same author says that there were in 1904, 81,772 criminals incarcerated in the 1,333 civil prisons of the United States, and "23,034 children and young persons, between seven and twenty-one years of age, in the ninety-three reformatory institutions."

The criminals confined in penitentiaries in the United States in 1880 were 35,538, or 709 to each one million of population; in 1890 there were 45,233, or 722 to each million, an increase of thirteen to the million in ten years; in 1904 there were 1,006 to each million, an increase of 284 in four years. This looks like a very rapid increase. But such a conclusion would not be reliable without a very careful study of the crimes and of the criminals in each penitentiary. It is probable that a large share of the increase would be accounted for by the very rapid increase of our population by immigration during that period.

In Massachusetts in 1860 there were 13.4 sentences for crime for each one thousand of population; in 1880, it was 15.2 for each one thousand. In the same State, for crimes not including drunkenness, during the period 1860—1880, the ratio fell from 7.6 to 6.1 to each one thousand of population. During the same period the sentences for high crimes fell from three-tenths to two-tenths to one thousand population.

Anticipating the time when "there shall be none to hurt nor destroy," these statistical facts are not very comforting. Certainly if these desirable ends are to be realized there must be something accomplished that will effect a radical diminution of the vice and crime that so greatly afflict human society. For it must be recognized that however much may be accomplished in material improvement, man makes real progress only as he attains to conditions that tend to the abolition of the evidences of depraved and selfish life. Wealth accumulated is not, alone, evidence of progress. Pleasure alone is not evidence of real progress. Art alone is not evidence of real progress. Only that promotes and evidences true progress that, along with these, brings, not to a few but to all, peace, quietness, and assurance.

What, then, is the solution of the problem? What the remedy that will effect the removal of these evil and destructive conditions?

Much may be accomplished by careful and thorough scientific investigation of causes, and

the application of scientific methods of relief. There is great need of education upon the causes and conditions that promote, and the methods that will tend to the abatement of vice and crime. Every right-minded man and woman will welcome every possible contribution that science and culture can make to this solution.

There is also need for wise and effective legislation, and for vigorous enforcement of law, with a view to the abolition of the conditions and institutions promotive of vice and crime. If, as Doctor Devine says, a probation officer of New York told him, that nine-tenths of the misery in that city is due to the social evil, then every legislature should give its best thought to the enactment of laws for the annihilation of this awful traffic in human shame, and every executive officer should make it a chief task to enforce such laws. If, as the Supreme Court of the United States, and of several of the States say, the larger part of crime is the direct or the indirect fruitage of the liquor traffic, then every legislature, State and National, should give its most

careful, vigorous, and immediate attention to the enactment of laws looking to the complete extinction of this unjustifiable curse of the ages, and every executive officer should see that such laws are vigorously and unrelentingly enforced. And more, every man that claims to be a man, should give his best energy, his sacrificial energy, to seeing that legislators and executives are elected that will do these things.

But why are these things not done? There are several reasons.

The real causes of vice and crime escape detection by even the most skillful type of scientific investigation; and as well they do not yield to any type of scientific method of treatment. Nor does education reach the seat of the difficulty. The tendency toward vice and crime is not primarily the result of either physical defect, or of lack of mental culture. It lies deeper; it has its basis in personal character, in lack of moral integrity and purpose. It is in moral defect, a defect that neither science nor education can

reach, and hence a defect that neither can permanently remedy.

The same is true as to legislation and enforcement. Defective legislation is not the result of a lack of knowledge upon the part of the legislator; nor is it because of so great desire to protect the rights of the individual from public infringement; nor is defective enforcement because of weakness of executives, mental or physical. In both legislators and executives the chief defect is moral defect.

The fundamental condition of the abatement of vice and crime is the development of a race that does not love vice and does not choose to be criminal. Hence the fundamental condition of an effective solution of the problem before us is the increasingly effective universal elevation of moral standards and of moral purposes.

If human history teaches anything, it teaches that social progress to be permanent and effective to the removal of the evils of society, must rest upon a moral basis, the true moral basis.

Where, then, is the true moral basis?

Measured by the highest possible standards of simplicity, equity, motive, and universality, it must be clear to every one that will candidly consider, that it is found in the Christian system, as evidenced by the fundamental social principles of that system, divine Fatherhood, human brotherhood, equality, co-operation, love.

This is not to speak against the scientific method; it is only to say that while the scientific method is efficient, aside from Christianity it is not sufficient. Neither is it to speak against anything that the reliable psychologist may say as to change of temperamental or physical conditions that may conduce to vicious and criminal conduct. It is simply to recognize that at the last analysis vice and crime are expressions of moral defect, and must have moral remedy. It is to say that the motive and the energy necessary to real improvement in these relations must be more than science or education can supply. There must be born in the individual conscious conviction of moral obligation, and fixed purpose to meet such obligation, the source and spring of

which is God himself, all of which is set forth and outlined in the gospel of the kingdom.

The real, permanent, and world-wide solution of the problem of vice and crime is to be reached, therefore, only through the effective promulgation and individual application of this gospel. "Ye must be born again" expresses a social need as real and as universal as is the religous need it expresses; born to a higher conception of relation and obligation here, and to a keener conviction of duty now.

This being true, there rests upon the church of Jesus Christ universal, the visible representative of the kingdom of God, the agency for the promulgation and exemplification of the gospel, the duty, and to it is given the privilege, of making this application and effecting this solution, the only solution that will rid the race of vice and its shame, of crime and its devastation.

By this is not meant that the church shall abate in the least her effort at evangelization. She must greatly increase it, for this is itself a primary element in applying the gospel.

But along with this the church must, with a view to promoting the social welfare, greatly increase her effort for the practical and effective application of the gospel to the great social problems. Very surely the church has never yet measured her strength in meeting this task.

But to what particular end shall the church exert her energies toward the application of the gospel for the remedying of these evils?

First, to the practice of exemplification of true social ideals as set forth in the Word of God. The race will never be convinced of the value of the social principles taught in the Word of God by the church telling others how they should live, but only by the church herself exemplifying those ideals. This is as true in relation to vice and crime as it is true in relation to commerce, industry, or politics. It is true in every relation.

Second, the church must by all possible and worthy methods seek directly the diminution of vice and crime with a view to their ultimate extinction. In her efforts to do this she must seek as rapidly as possible the removal of whatever

fosters or promotes them or either of them. She must also seek to develop in the individual and in society such a type of character as will of its own choice disapprove and turn away from vice and crime. These forms of evil flourish because so large a part of society approve of them as means of gratifying personal passion and desire. Few persons are vicious or criminal for the mere sake of being such; but thousands are so because they choose to find in this way the gratification of selfish passion or appetite. This selfish attitude can be changed not by science, not by education, but only by the development of a type of character from which selfishness is eliminated.

It is argued by some that the proposition to remove inducements to vice coupled with the proposition to develop character are largely contradictory. They hold that to remove temptation is to remove a condition essential to the development of character. To strengthen their argument they refer to the Bible story of the forbidden fruit in Eden. But it must be remem-

bered that before the story of the forbidden fruit is the first commission given to man, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion . . . over everything that moveth on the earth." If this positive, constructive commission had been obeyed, we might not have had the sad story of the fall. The race has made progress as it has sought the application of means and conditions that positively promote progress, and not as it has withstood temptations to do the wrong. As to the development of character, it should be remembered that character is developed, not according to the degree that men refrain from doing the wrong, but according to the degree to which they devote themselves to doing the right and the good. Contributory to this there has come development to the individual and to society as men have put away and kept away whatever solicits to vice and crime.

How, then, shall the church exert its efforts for the practical application of the gospel to effect the extinction of vice and crime?

The answer is twofold:

1. By so relating itself to the state, the nation, as to create a legal condition such as will to the largest possible degree eradicate these evils.

God has established two public institutions for the saving and blessing of the race—the Church and the State. And the church will only do its duty before God and before the state when in the person of its individual membership, at the ballot-box and at every other point of contact, it does its best to create a government that will "make it as easy as possible to do right and as hard as possible to do wrong." In seeking to do this the church, acting through the free choice of its individual membership, can seek to accomplish two things:

First, to bring vice and crime to exposure, and the vicious and criminal to restraint and correction.

Nothing from without acts so effectively to eliminate vice as exposure to the light, provided such exposure is not so made as to popularize

the vice. Nothing from without operates so effectively to check crime as the effective restraint and proper training of the criminal. It is an open question whether punishment of the criminal operates to eliminate crime, or even diminish it. Modern experiments in elevating restraint, instruction, training, and probation seem to be yielding better fruitage.

A few years ago in one of our western cities, when mayor and policemen refused to act to rid the city of houses of shame, a publisher of the city exhibited in his daily, side by side, the picture of every such house and the photographs of the supposedly reputable business men who rented them for immoral purposes. The effect for good was very marked. Such exposure, not of vice itself, but of the men who stand as its sponsors, will do much toward its elimination.

Second, the Church must awake fully to the fact that the State is established of God to minister to the well-being of society, and that it is a most important part of the duty of the Church, through its individual membership, to assist in

rendering the State efficient to the largest possible degree to the fulfilling of its mission.

2. The second element in the answer to the question, "How shall the Church exert itself?" is—

It must bend its energies, individual and organic, to the securing and developing and making universal of such a type of manhood and womanhood as will of its own choice turn away from vice and crime. It must give larger attention to the practical problem of saving men.

Yes, the practical problem. Jesus Christ was no mere theorist. He was eminently practical. "He went about doing good." He "came to seek and to save the lost." To save them, not simply to theoretical righteousness, but to righteousness that means practical rightness. Here is the great need, and it is in an important sense the great task of the Church. The need of society is, vastly more universally even in Christian lands, a type of manhood and womanhood that shuns vice and crime, not for fear of exposure, nor for fear of punishment, nor simply because they are

"vipers of such frightful mien," but because they love God, love truth, love virtue.

The man who abstains from vice, or from promoting vice, for fear of exposure, is vicious still, and only waits opportunity under sufficient cover; the man who turns from crime for fear of punishment is a criminal still, and only awaits opportunity sufficiently shielded from the public officer. But he who turns from vice because he loves virtue, who abstains from crime because he is so busy rendering his fellow-man service born of love, is developing or possessed of a character that will be a buttress to human society, and that will bear the test of the vision of God and of the eternities.

The gospel remedy for vice and crime is the regeneration of life and the invigoration, inspiration of manhood, by the Spirit and life of Jesus Christ. Here is the fruitful field of activity for the Church, to lead boys and men, girls and women to such an acceptance of Jesus Christ as will secure to them this positive regenerative life, to be followed by such courses of instruction,

training, and service as will make every member actively contributory to the highest human well-being. As this is done, the sad picture drawn by Hosea will fade away and be displaced by that presented by Isaiah, when "they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea."

VIII.

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES APPLIED

VIII.

SOCIAL PRINCIPLES APPLIED

THERE are social problems of great magnitude awaiting solution. This is by no means saying that no progress has been made toward their solution. Great progress has been made. But there is yet a many-voiced demand for the better application of the gospel to the relief of unfavorable conditions that yet prevail; and this in order that the indivdiual and society at large may enjoy the better conditions that are possible. And as well, that the value and the power of the gospel may be more fully demonstrated.

How, then, shall the social principles of Christianity, those principles upon the application of which depends the remedy of unfavorable conditions, how shall they be practically applied? applied so as to reach the desired results?

Preliminary to answering this question it is necessary to answer another question; that question, "Why is it so?". Stated more elab-

orately this one single question becomes several questions:

What is the cause of the conditions of which complaint is made?

Why exist the unbalanced conditions of society?

Why is it that some are criminal and some are law-abiding?

Why is it that some are harassed by poverty, while others are loaded down with riches?

Why is it that some are bound with chains of slavery, while others are free to fasten upon the chains of bondage?

Why is it that such conditions exist?

With beings such as man, each possessed of the ability to contribute to the other's good, with nature upon every hand abundant if not even profligate with her store of plenty, why do these unfavorable conditions exist?

The question "Why?" is important, not simply from the side of inquisitive curiosity, but it is important for the reason that its answer will contribute, indeed is necessary, to understand-

ing how to make the application of those principles, the proper application of which will relieve the difficulty.

There are three, and only three possible causes of these conditions.

They are caused by man's environment—or

They are caused by man himself—or

They are the product of the two combined.

Since these exhaust the entire realm of possible causes, the real cause must be found within them somewhere.

Do they originate in man's environment? By environment is meant here all that lies outside of man, speaking of him both individually and as a race.

There are certain calamities which are uncaused by man, themselves the result of his environment, as the storm at sea, death by accident, the famine that results from natural causes.

But these are not the conditions that to-day are creating discontent. The conditions of which complaint is made are those in which in some

way and to some degree human intent and purpose figures and has a place. Indeed it is only of unfavorable social conditions that have their basis in human intent that men specially complain. Conditions, however severe they may be, that have their origin in forces or conditions beyond human control, while they bring hardship, do not raise the complaint of bitter protest.

General William Booth, of the Salvation Army, said, "Hundreds of British working men, able-bodied, skilled artisans, willing and anxious to work, are with their families literally starving and perishing from lack of food, fuel, and clothing."

If this were the result of conditions entirely beyond human control, if it were the result of environment solely, then though the distress and suffering would be no less, there could be no just ground of complaint against fellow-man. In other words, we complain, and very justly, against conditions that can be traced to human purpose and intent.

But this reduces us to where we charge all these unfavorable *social* conditions to the purpose and intent of man. But some tell us we cannot justly charge them to men individually, but to institutions, to conditions, to systems which men impose.

This may for the moment be admitted. For it surely is true that as seen to-day, unfavorable social conditions, whether in the realm of industry, in the realm of commerce, in the realm of crime, or in the realm more specifically social, are to a large degree the result of conditions of organization and operation that are in a sense super-imposed by the more or less closely associated operation of bodies or classes of men.

But this is by no means wholly so. Men complain of conditions and systems, when they themselves bring upon themselves self-imposed conditions that render their own lives a burden and a disappointment. A gentleman, a laboring man, said, speaking of the large number of unmarried men and women, that if men could earn enough to care for wife and family comfortably,

nine would marry and rear families where now one does so. He was answered that his statement to be any way near the truth must contain another proviso; that is, that, not only if men had the opportunity to earn enough that they could support a wife and family, but the further proviso that, having such opportunity they *would use* the opportunity and use the money they earn to meet their real needs.

There are scores of men earning sufficient to care for families, but who find themselves in financial straits because so large a portion of what they earn is applied to other than necessary purposes. This is no more true of laboring men than of other men, but the laboring man is so situated that he experiences the pinch more than some whose income is large. But in the majority of cases of that character the condition would not be changed materially, no matter how much the income were increased.

But conceding all that may be said as to unfavorable conditions being the result of institutions and systems; conceding all that the most

radical may claim, in what sense does this concession relieve the situation?

For when properly analyzed, it is found that these institutions, these systems, can, in the very nature of the case, be no more nor less than the expression of the purposes of men acting individually or collectively. Governmental systems, whether good or bad, are the expression of the purpose of men. Commercial systems, industrial systems, whether good or bad, are the expression of the purposes and choices of men. The more immediate and at the same time more general social conditions are the same.

The Bible is the setting forth of the will of God, and of the plan of human salvation. But the organized church, the visible church, as we see it and know it in its various forms and organizations, is the expression of varying interpretations of the Word of God by men. Hence it may be said of institutions and systems, from the church out through the many and varying forms of organized activity, that they are the expressions of the understanding and of the choices

and purposes of men. They are what men have made them.

An immediate, logical, and necessary inference from this fact is that the character of institutions and systems, and especially the operation and execution of institutions and systems will be determined by the character of the men who organize and execute them. If this be true, then it follows that if institutions and systems are bad, it is because bad men organize and operate them. Then it follows that if institutions are to be corrected and made better, the only way to accomplish it is to have the men made better who operate them.

We speak of the evils of the child-labor system, a system that is visiting widespread destruction upon childhood, and ultimately upon manhood and womanhood; and we lay the responsibility for this iniquity upon the men who operate the mines and factories where the iniquity is practiced. How, then, can a change for the better be effected? Only by the men who are concerned, it is answered. But it must be clear

that before a change for the better will be made *by* them, so far as their choices are concerned, there must be a change made *in* them.

But it may be answered, "No; the fault is with the system, and we will change it by legal enactment." Let this, too, be conceded. But conceding this is to revoke the former concession, and to say that the men who control and operate these factories do not bear the entire responsibility for the iniquities practiced. For according to this latter concession, the body politic, the citizenship at large who tolerates such a system, have the right and the power to change these conditions and hence such citizenship is itself responsible for the conditions.

This being true, it does not, however, effect the fundamental requirement as to improved conditions. It only distributes the responsibility over a large circle, and leaves it rest, not upon the system as an expressed or accepted method of operating, nor upon the machinery of the system, but upon the individual citizens of the State or Nation. Every citizen is, in a measure,

responsible for every hour of toil inhumanly imposed upon a child in State or Nation. Every citizen is responsible in a measure for every glass of liquor sold to make men drunken. Every citizen must bear his share of the responsibility for every murder, and for every assault committed in his State or Nation under the influence of liquor authorized to be sold by State or Nation. The effort to lay the responsibility for unfavorable conditions upon laws, and institutions, and system, is a subterfuge and a snare.

If all this be true, then how change conditions?

It may be answered, "By the enactment and enforcement of better laws." But how can this be accomplished? Only by getting better men, and then better legislation. This leads one step further in our inquiry.

What is it that leads men who organize and operate great commercial and industrial enterprises to impose the hardships under which so large a portion of society suffer? What is it upon the part of the voting citizenship of a city,

state, or nation that leads them to tolerate and even authorize by legal enactment, conditions that result in the imposition of the hardships under which so many suffer?

There can be but two answers, either ignorance, a lack of knowledge or foresight; or, a disregard of the known rights of fellow-men. These may act separately or together.

A large amount of social hardship and suffering has resulted from ignorance, a lack of knowledge or foresight. A clear illustration is the action of the framers of a former constitution of the State of Ohio. In that document was placed a statement to the effect that the sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage should never be licensed in that State. The intention was to prohibit the sale of intoxicants for beverage purposes in the State. But the failure upon the part of framers of the constitution to recognize that the term "license" might be given a very strict interpretation, left the way open for the later Dow tax system, and the State was flooded with drink, and cursed with its results.

The fact of ignorance necessitates the work of education, and to the promotion of this work the church of Jesus Christ, the exponent of the Christian system, must devote its energies most heartily.

But it would be a great mistake to conclude that all the evil, or that the greater part of social evils are the result of ignorance. It is not because of ignorance that laborers are deprived of their just wages. It is not because of ignorance that great systems are organized which force the flow of wealth to a few centers. It is not ignorance that fastens upon the nation the drink traffic, the cause of more social suffering than all the other causes combined.

However much of evil ignorance may bring; however much it may unite with selfishness to increase the burdens of society, the one fundamental cause of all social hardship is selfish disregard of the rights of fellow-men. This is the one seed that, more than all else, produces the evil fruits that curse society. This is the deadly upas tree that has poisoned the atmosphere of

the business, the industrial, the political, the entire social world, until upon every hand are seen the withered skeletons of hopeless, worn-out, indifferent, indolent, vicious, and criminal thousands. Nor does this tree distill its poison only from factories, and mines, and at the will of great commercial enterprises; it grows in the homes of laboring men as well; the evidences of its effects are to be seen everywhere.

What, then, is the remedy, the ultimate, the real remedy?

Good legislation is helpful. Effective enforcement gives to legislation its supreme value. But the final remedy is in setting right the individual.

The curse of human society, the curse of the social world is bad men. Not that all men are bad, by any means. Not that all men conspire to bring outrage, oppression, crime, starvation, and death. But still the curse of the social world is bad men. Bad men who seek to dominate the commercial world. Bad men who would reduce to a condition little better than slavery those

who are in their employ. Bad men who would exploit the childhood of the nation to increase the flow of gold to their own coffers. Bad men who would submerge the State and Nation in crime and debauchery if only their wealth might be increased. Bad men as well in the great body of laboring men. Bad men and bad women who by profligacy in the saloon and in the house of shame, place upon children and wives the burdens that wear their lives out with toil and send them to premature graves, bearing the load of sorrow imposed by wicked husbands and fathers. Bad men at the ballot box, who for a drink of whiskey, or a cheap cigar, will barter away their liberties and their rights. Bad systems? Yes, bad systems, but bad because the men behind them are bad; to be corrected only as men themselves are brought to a due appreciation of the privileges, the rights, and the duties of true manhood.

This, then, leads to the answer to the question, How apply the social principles of Christianity? That is, conceding that social conditions

are not what they should be, and conceding that Christianity in its publication of the equality of all men in natural rights, and its imposing the obligation of unselfish, mutual co-operation for the common weal is right, conceding that in this is presented in principle the remedy for these conditions, how shall these principles be applied so as to bring into effective realization the condition that the application of these principles will produce?

It may be answered, By securing such legislation as will require the application of these principles, and by the effective enforcement of such legislation. But it must be clear to every thoughtful mind that such legislation and such enforcement are possible only when there is in at least a considerable majority of the individual units of society a high conscientious regard for human rights and human well-being.

The sum of this is, that the fundamental condition of true social betterment is, the instruction and awakening of individual minds and consciences to high moral ideals and obligations

in sufficient numbers to accomplish these ends. In other words, the social principles of Christianity, the Golden Rule of human equality, of unselfish co-operation, will be applied effectively to the remedying of bad social conditions, whether in commerce, in industry, in politics, in church, or in private life, only as these principles are first applied to the instruction and awakening of individual men and women so as to secure, upon their part, the application of these principles in all their multifarious relations in human society.

Nor must this be simply an intellectual assent to the necessity of better conditions, and to the value of these principles; but it must be a change of attitude, a change of life, a change that roots out of employers and employes selfish ambition and motives of action, and puts in their place the love of fellow-man as a brother. Not simply of fellow-man who stands upon an equality in business relations, or in so-called social relations, but a change that will cause employer to love employe, and employe to love employer

as brothers. A change that will cause the voter at the ballot box to see in his ballot his one supreme medium of expressing his love for society at large, and not a means for the advancement of personal or partisan political preference. Less than this will always leave legislation a tangle, industries an agency of exploit, and immediate social institutions in the hands of harpies that prey upon the body of a suffering citizenship.

In this way, and in this way alone, can society be brought to where justice and equity shall approach universality of application, and where mercy shall be the crowning attribute of society as it is of Jehovah himself. There is a possibility of a really effective application of the elevating social principles set forth in the Christian system, only as there is first a wide-spread and conscientious application of those principles in individual life and conduct.

This being true, the first and most important task in behalf of the real well-being of human society is the effective promulgation of the Chris-

tian system; such promulgation as shall be effective to the transformation of human character, life, and conduct, by bringing men and women individually under the influence of the spirit and life of Jesus Christ.

And this is but to say that socially as well as religiously Jesus Christ is the hope of the world. True and permanent social regeneration is a possibility only as there is first true and permanent religous regeneration. "Ye must be born again" is the fundamental social truth as really as it is the fundamental religious truth.

IX.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL WEAL

IX.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL WEAL

THAT there is a social as well as a religious problem, no student of history or of current life can deny.

That the social problem is as old as the religious problem is equally evident.

That the Christian system recognizes both of these problems, and proposes their solution, must appear to every candid student of the sacred Scriptures; for nowhere do we find stated more clearly the relation of man to his fellow-man, and the obligations that grow out of that relation.

That the Christian system recognizes these problems, and their effective solution, as most intimately related, is shown by the two great commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Since there is a social problem; since the Christian system recognizes it and proposes its

solution; since the duties of man to man are, by the Christian system, declared so imperative that they are put second only to the duties that man owes to God; since the church is the authorized exponent and agent of the Christian system, then the solving of the social problem must be a part of the mission and duty of the church of Jesus Christ. Its duty in this relation is to assist in promulgating and applying the gospel of Jesus Christ, in both its divine and its human relations, to the promoting of man's well-being, embracing his well-being socially as well as religiously.

That the gospel has not yet been thus fully applied, must be clear to every one. For, while we might find some difficulty in deciding in advance just what will be the condition when it is effectively applied, yet no one who believes in the equality of all men as to natural rights, and the duty of unselfish, co-operative service in behalf of fellow-men, both of which are clearly embraced in the Golden Rule; no one who believes in these as principles of the Christian

teaching, can for a moment believe that to-day the conditions which the application of these principles will produce has been attained.

When in the anthracite coal mines of Pennsylvania thousands of boys under fourteen years of age are employed contrary to the laws of the State, and to the positive detriment of these children; where for nine hours a day these little fellows toil in the breakers, bending over streams of coal which pour out clouds of dust so thick that the light cannot penetrate them; when in the factories of the South children of six and seven years are at work for twelve and thirteen hours a day, their fingers mangled by machinery, their bodies limp with exhaustion; when in New England, the birthplace of American liberty, hundreds of children under thirteen years of age toil at the mills, and men and women work under such a strain that they are worn out at forty-five years of age, and ruthlessly thrown aside to give place to others; when among the cotton mills of the South troops of children twelve years of age and under are dragged out of bed, to

eat their meager breakfast, and rushed off to the mills with sleepy eyes to toil amid the hum and roar of machinery for eleven hours a day; when there are among us thousands of weary workingmen and women taxed beyond their strength to earn enough for mere subsistence; when clerks and bookkeepers, insufficiently paid, toil till life is a burden, and then in many cases are advised by their employers to supplement their paltry income by lives of vice; when these conditions prevail upon the one hand, while upon the other our national wealth is increasing by billions a year; and when in order to pour that increase into the hands of a few, the prices of the prime necessities are being forced higher and higher, when these conditions exist, surely no one can say that the social problem has been solved, or that the principles of the gospel have been so applied as to produce ideal social conditions.

Or, taking another view, when in many of the great cities of our nation there is an organized traffic in social vice, carried on to the extent of the debauching and ruining of thousands of in-

nocent and unsuspecting girls every year; when the traffic in the lives, the souls, and the bodies of men through the liquor business is carried on under authority to the extent that this one business, whost chief effect is to ruin character, despoil the home, fill the jail, the poor-house, and the asylum; when this business of ruin is carried on to the extent that it is the largest single business in the land; when political parties claiming honor and respectability not only have the hardihood to allow these things, but actually get the endorsement of a majority of the people to this awful carnage of crime, under these conditions, surely no one will say that the social problem has been solved, or that the gospel has been so applied as to produce ideal conditions. Mention is made of conditions only as they exist in our own land, with the full knowledge that in other lands social conditions are vastly more unfavorable than with us.

In view of these conditions, and in view of the great light that the gospel has thrown upon the question of the rights and the possibilities

before human society, it is not strange that men become restless, and demand action that will result in the abolition of this carnage of injustice, vice, and crime. Nor is it strange that men, seeing the church with the torch of truth, the gospel of Jesus Christ, the gospel of human equality, of human rights in its hands—it is not strange that there are those who seeing this, conceive that the church is not doing its full duty in the interests of society to-day.

But we need to be careful in our judgment in this relation. Attention must be given to the great good that has been done by the help of the light that the gospel affords, and then it may be proper to decide whether the church merits blame for its attitude to-day.

The social problem is by no means a modern one. It is as old as human history. On almost the first page of history is the story of a brother who, regardless of his brother's rights, took his life; then to the inquiry, "Where is thy brother?" he returned the heartless answer, "Am I my

brother's keeper?" The social problem dates back at least to the jealousy of Cain.

Not only is the problem an old one, but it is, and always has been, a very aggravated one. As presented from the industrial side, it is to-day a very vexing one, but not nearly so much as it was in ages past.

For thousands of years the social problem from the industrial side involved the curse of human slavery. The monuments of Egypt and the ruins of Babylon bear witness to the existence of slavery in its severest forms in each of those nations. The Jews held slaves until the exile in Babylon, though slavery as practiced by them was in a modified form, the slaves being given the privilege of complete manumission at certain periods. Slavery was practiced by all, or nearly all the nations of antiquity. It existed in Greece and Rome for centuries before the beginning of the Christian era. Almost two-thirds of the population of Rome in the days of the empire were slaves. Slavery was transmitted down through the ages, even being brought to our own country,

where it continued till after the middle of the last century.

While in many respects the condition of the laboring masses to-day calls for vast improvement, their condition generally is vastly better than was that of the slaves, so much better that comparison can scarcely be made. Not only this, but so long as slavery as an industrial system was continued, it was impossible to elevate labor to the plane of respectability and honor. In our own country and in England as well, the abolition of slavery meant not only the freeing of the individual slave, or the black race, but it meant the elevation of labor to a position of honor and respectability unknown and impossible before; the recognition of the laborer as upon the same plane as every other man.

But how was the abolition of slavery accomplished? By some it is denied that it was accomplished in any sense through the agency of the church, for the reason that the Scriptures do not in so many words forbid it, and the further reason that for more than two centuries it ex-

isted in our own country largely with the endorsement of the church.

It is not claimed that the church, as an institution, effected the overthrow of slavery, but that the gospel as preached and presented by the church did. It was this, the promulgation of the gospel of Christ, the gospel of human brotherhood, that brought freedom to the slaves.

Here it is proper to speak more particularly of the relation of the church to the social problem, the visible church, looking upon it as a divinely established institution. That is, the church was not established for the direct purpose of overthrowing slavery, or for putting away any other single, distinct form of social evil, great as these evils are. If it were, it would be inconceivable that any of these forms of evil should be found in, or in any way connected with the church, unless the church has become entirely apostate. Then, too, we would have good reason for denouncing ancient Judaism, the church of the Mosaic dispensation, as an entire fraud, because the Jews held slaves under some form for prob-

ably nearly a thousand years. Then, too, we might well be surprised to find New Testament writers advising the slaves to obey their masters; and we might well be horrified at the Apostle Paul advising the slave, Onesimus, to return to his master, Philemon, and sending to Philemon a letter requesting him to receive back Onesimus kindly, all of which we do find.

But it may be asked in surprise, "If the mission of the church is not to overthrow such a diabolical institution as human slavery and kindred social evils, then pray what is its mission? especially what is its mission to man as a social being?

In order to reach an answer to this very appropriate question it must be recognized first of all that the church is not an organization composed of people living outside of and apart from human society, and from the conditions present in human society, intended to stand as an external reformatory force; but it is an organization composed of people who are themselves members of society, effected in their manner of

living, in their modes of thinking and acting, in their personal lives and characters by conditions around them and under which they live. One of the fundamental beliefs of the church is that all men are sinners, sinners against God, and sinners against their fellow-men. And the church includes itself and its own members in this same category. Not a body of men and women perfect in thinking or perfect in acting, and trying to bring others to their standard of perfection. But a body of sinners trusting Jesus Christ for salvation and in process of training and development to lives of actual righteousness.

What, then, is the distinct mission of the church, as it relates to human society at large, if it is not to overthrow and put away the social evils that effect society?

The distinct mission of the church is that which our Lord expressed in what is termed "The Great Commission," that is, to preach and teach the gospel; to preach and teach the principles of the gospel as they relate to both the God-ward and the man-ward side of human life, with a

view to having these principles accepted and practiced in the lives of men. That through the acceptance and practice of these principles two ends, viewed from the social side, may be accomplished:

First, that the individual may, in answer to his willing acceptance of Jesus Christ, be saved to a life of progressive development here.

Second, that through the promulgation, acceptance, and willing practice of these principles, the kingdom of Christ, which is the kingdom of righteousness, equity, and peace, may be established and progressively promoted in human society.

This is as truly the mission and work of the church as is its mission to help men prepare for the future life. In a very important sense the very life of the church depends upon the church seeing more clearly and fulfilling more largely this phase of her mission. This is in full harmony with one of the latest statements of Doctor Eucken, of Germany, one of the greatest theologians and Christian philosophers of our day.

He says, "The maintenance of Christianity requires considerable changes in its traditional form. Religion must enter into closer touch with human activity and at the same time become a more powerful leaven in the world, . . . deeply rooted in the life-process and revealing itself in this process."

The church, speaking of it more particularly as an organized institution, viewed from the social side, has, as it relates to the great task of promoting social weal, or as Doctor Eucken would say, the task of relating itself to, so as to reveal its religion "in the life process," a twofold problem or mission:

First, to gather from human society at large a body of people who desire, by the acceptance and practice of the life and principles of the gospel, to develop into lives of social righteousness. Hence the wrong living of these themselves has to be corrected. Hence it is that there are in the church men who, while professing to seek a better life, themselves live in the toleration

and practice of evils such as human slavery, liquor selling and drunkard making.

The church has a second mission—to publish abroad the gospel of Christ which carries in itself the principles of social equality, which, as they are accepted and put into practice will lead the individual and society at large away from the evils that have cursed and still do curse society.

Expressing the idea more briefly:

The church of Jesus Christ is not, properly speaking, a direct, but an indirect agency of social reform; it is a propaganda. It is not an organization whose mission it is to compel men to accept and practice the principles which it teaches. It is an agency whose mission as it relates to society, is to propagate, to disseminate fundamental social principles, which themselves, blessed of God, vitalize human thought and life, and work out the great social reforms of which society has so long been in need, and many of which are still so greatly needed.

But it may be objected: Admitting that this is true, then the church as an agency of social reform is too indirect, and hence moves too slowly; hence some form of organization should be effected that will operate more immediately and directly.

To this several answers are to be made.

It may be, and very probably is true of the church that being composed as it is, not of a picked class of people, but of people from all classes, the young and the old, the learned and the unlearned, the rich and the poor, the radical and the conservative, the selfish and the unselfish, and being surrounded by conditions that do not always favor aggressive action, hindered many times by men and women who seek the cover of the church to hide their own selfishness, and take advantage of the machinery of the church to promote their own purposes—it may be and very certainly is true that the church has not been as vigorous and hence not as helpful in applying the principles of the gospel to the solu-

tion of great social problems as it should have been.

It should also be answered that the church makes no objection to the organization and promotion of auxiliary agencies to assist in the practical application of these principles. On this point the church simply holds that in order to effective operation of such auxiliary agencies, it is necessary that they adhere closely to the fundamental principles laid down in the gospel itself.

The church raises no objection to the organization of society for governmental purposes. Indeed it hails with delight such organization, not always approving in full the plans of organization, but recognizing them as of value. With the exception of some bodies of the church that have upon them the shackles imposed by semi-pagan, mediæval nations, the church hails with delight the complete separation between the church and institutions of political government. The church raises no objection to the organization of political parties, leagues, or societies,

that have as their purpose the promotion of special phases of social reform, so long as they are of practical value. But the church insists that all such organizations can work effectively only as they work in harmony with and for the application of the fundamental social principles taught in the gospel.

There is still one more answer to the objection that the church moves too slowly, a most important phase of the answer.

It is found in part in the fact already stated, that the problem of social weal is a very old one, dating back to the very dawn of history. It is found in part in the fact that it is a universal problem, though not always the same in all places; not the same at all times; but yet a question universal to the race. There is no people, nor language, nor tongue, where it does not exist, or where it has been fully solved.

But this is not the worst. It is a problem that has existed, and still exists, not because of peculiar political conditions; not because of peculiar theories of political economy; not because

of peculiar religious conditions. None of these somewhat accidental conditions is the occasion of this problem. It exists because of wrong conceptions, and wrong purposes, and wrong motives in men, in the human heart universal.

Some lay the responsibility wholly upon the rich; the rich are to blame, but the poor as well. Some blame it upon the ruling classes as some are termed; it has its seat with them, but with the ruled as well. Some blame it upon the employer, but it is chargeable to the employe as well. No better proof of this is needed than the fact that when by the turn of the wheel of fortune the employer and the employe exchange places, the problem remains as large as it was before.

Some blame it upon the church. Surely the church must take its share of the blame; but it rests as well upon those outside the church. Some blame it upon the preachers; they must take their share, but the laity theirs as well. The fact is that none have yet come to ideal character or life, and hence all must share the blame

for social disorder. The basis of the problem is in the wrong conceptions, wrong purposes, wrong motives of men, and it can be changed only as their conceptions change.

Here, then, is the explanation of the fact that the work of the church for social betterment goes so slow. The problem is a universal one; it grows out of wrong conditions in the hearts of men; it is aggravated by all the inherited misconceptions, prejudices, jealousies, greed, laziness, wickedness, selfishness of the centuries past. It is a problem that can be solved in its completeness, not by simply establishing some new political conditions; not by fixing a more equitable scale of wages; not by establishing a new basis or system of property ownership; not by enlarging or extending the political franchise; not by simply putting some out and others in. All these may be external steps in the process of the solution.

But all of these may be done, and immediately, or in a very short time, the social problem will be as aggravated as it is to-day.

There is but one plan or condition of a hopeful solution of the social problem, not of to-day, not of our country, not of our people, but of the ages and of the race. That is, by the promulgation and general acceptance and practice of the principles of social well-being expressed in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

This is not to say that successive steps in the process of solution will not bring successive stages of relief; but only as along with those successive stages these fundamental principles are more generally understood, accepted, and practiced. It is simply saying that the teaching, acceptance, and practice of these principles must keep pace with, if not in advance of, the taking of these successive steps.

The church of Jesus Christ does this fundamental work, propagating the gospel, influencing men to accept and practice these fundamental principles. Hence its work not only goes slowly, but is of a character that it is not readily seen in connection with the immediate solution of

these problems. It is work done at the foundations of society.

It is true that Paul counseled slaves to obey their masters; but it is also true that the principles of the gospel taught by Paul and by the church ever since, have undermined the institutions of slavery until to-day it is unknown in Christian lands. It is true that Christian men have served their country on the field of battle; but it is also true that the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ as taught by the church are to-day operating to the practical abolition of war.

While it is true that professed Christian men have drunk intoxicating liquors, and some of them have their eyes so blinded that they would even put the bottle to their neighbor's lips to make him drunk, it is also true that the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as taught by the church are to-day banishing the traffic from Christian lands.

While it is true that professed Christian men have taken advantage of commonly accepted commercial ideas and standards to advance their

own financial interests greatly to the disadvantage and even impoverishment of others, yet the church has ever held out the light of divine truth that teaches that justice is the law of the kingdom of God, and that mercy is his supreme delight.

While it is true that men in the church have without doubt, and many yet do, rob the hireling of his wages, and refuse to allow him what is his just due, yet the church as the agency of the kingdom of God has held forth the truth of the brotherhood and equal essential rights of all men, sometimes herself being blind to that truth, until to-day it is taking hold of the lives of men and nations, changing industrial systems, modifying social ideas, and transforming national politics.

Yes, the church may move slowly, but she carries the torch that lights the ages, and that will ultimately bring to practical realization the social as well as the religious weal of the whole world.

X

LIFE SPIRITUAL AND SERVICE SOCIAL

X.

LIFE SPIRITUAL AND SERVICE SOCIAL

"If any man hath not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

"Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus."

"Be filled with the Spirit." —*Paul.*

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven."

"I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me."

"Go, and do thou likewise." —*Jesus.*

PAUL and Jesus do not in these words set forth two different types of Christian life, but two phases of the same life; the inner and the outer life; the life of the spirit, and the life of service; two phases of the same life. We shall wholly misunderstand the teaching of both Jesus and Paul throughout, unless we keep this in mind as a fundamental fact in all of their teaching. That is, they teach, not that the life of the believer is a twofold life, but that it is one life having a twofold phase, the inner or hidden phase, the life of the spirit, and the outer or manifest phase, the life of service.

Just what, in actual practice, is the relation of the inner life of the spirit to the outer life of service? Are they in any sense the counterpart of each other? Or, is one in any sense to be looked upon as a substitute for the other? Or, can one in any sense exist without the other? Or, is one in any sense liable to be detrimental to the other? Or, is one the life, of which the other is the fruitage and proof? Or, do they have no relation at all to each other?

Too often these two phases of life have been viewed as quite separate and distinct, one from the other; some almost to the extent of thinking or implying that they have but little if any relation to each other.

That is, while it is expected that all believers shall externally comply with certain ritualistic and moral requirements, the latter chiefly of a negative character, yet, by many, the entire question of one's relation to God and duty seems to be thought to turn upon his inner or spiritual attitude; that if a man is right at heart, by which has been meant largely if he is a professed be-

liever, belongs to the church and keeps the ordinances, either his external life will by that fact be properly adjusted, or his faults or sins will be mercifully forgiven, and he will be sure of eternal felicity at God's right hand. By all of which is meant that if one supposes that he is right at heart, he need not be so particular as to his outer life.

From another side there has come the idea that, while there is much closer relation between the inner and the outer life than has just been indicated, yet the matter of chief concern, if not of sole importance in the Christian life is, to lay the emphasis on the spiritual or religious side; or religion and the religious life will gravitate to a mere interest in outer or external activities, as it is said, to a religion of doing.

There is danger of mistake on both sides of this phase of divine teaching. There have been great mistakes on what has been termed the spiritual side. Men have thought that the true Christian life is the life given wholly to spiritual meditation, contemplation, and prayer. Hence

the system of monasticism; life in the monastery and the nunnery; a life of seclusion, a shutting away of one's self from what are supposed to be special conditions of temptation, that thus opportunity may be had for devoting time and thought to meditation and prayer. But the history of the monastery and the nunnery falls far short of proving this to be a valuable system. Equally valueless is this principle when applied apart from the monastery. God made man to live and grow and thrive, spiritually as well as physically and mentally, in active touch and fellowship with the busy activites of life, proper time, of course, being taken for private meditation, study, and prayer.

On the other hand men and women interested in social welfare have undertaken the relief and correction of unfavorable conditions through purely social means, without regard to the influence of the inner spiritual life, but without pronounced and guaranteed success.

What, then, is the normal relation of the inner life of the Spirit and the outer life of service?

We have no better illustrative answer to this question than that furnished by the life of Jesus himself. There can be no question that his was a Spirit-filled life; nor that he was always, at one time as much as another, under the influence and direction of the Spirit. Nor can there be any question as to his life being a well balanced life.

What do we learn from Jesus, the standard illustration, as to the relation of these two phases of the one Christian life, the one phase known as the spiritual, the other as the outer or service life?

In this relation two facts stand out clear and plain:

First, he was careful to keep himself constantly open to the fountains of the Spirit.

There is abundant evidence that Jesus gave much time to meditation and prayer; but not in any such sense or degree as to indicate that his life was that of a recluse or a hermit. The Essenes were monks of his time and people, but nothing indicated that he was one of them. So

far removed was he from them, so ready was he to mingle with the people and to participate in the social pleasures of his time, that his enemies charged him with being "a gluttonous man and a winebibber." So much did he associate with all classes of people that he was denounced as "a friend of publicans and sinners." But the record of his prayer life is sufficient evidence that along with all else that he did, he lived a life of constant fellowship and communion with God, and thus kept his soul open constantly to the fountains of the spiritual life.

The second fact of importance is that Jesus gave a large measure of time and attention to activities that lay directly along the line of social service.

He said of himself that he "came not to be ministered unto but to minister"; not to be served but to serve. And this is exemplified throughout his public life. His conduct shows that however deeply he was interested in the souls of men, that interest was not of such a type that it led him to overlook their bodies, or

their present physical needs in any relation. If they were sick, he healed them; if they were crippled, he restored them; if they were blind, he gave them sight; if they were deaf, he gave them hearing; if they were hungry, he fed them. So much did he give himself to helpful service that years afterward, Peter, when preaching to Cornelius of the life of Jesus, did not speak of his wonderful preaching, nor of any formal system of doctrines that he taught, nor even of his long nights spent in prayer, but said that "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him."

It may be argued that he did this as a means of winning and holding the attention of the people to his teaching. Probably that is a part of the truth. But did he not do it also because of his compassion for men? Because the life of the Spirit in him impelled him to such acts of beneficence toward men? May it not be that he did it also in exemplification of the type of life and

spirit that those shall possess and manifest who are indeed his followers? That thus he might show that the kingdom of Christ, while it is a kingdom characterized by deep spirituality, is also a kingdom in which this spirtuality finds its legitimate expression in lives of unselfish service?

However we may explain these deeds of compassion of Jesus, the point that deserves attention is that the spirituality of Jesus found expression as really in his going about and doing good to those he met, as it did when he was engaged in teaching the people, or when he was alone with God in prayer. That is, Jesus was as really and as intensely spiritual when he was feeding the hungry, healing the sick, doing friendly, helpful service for those about him, as he was when he was preaching the Sermon on the Mount, or having his evening's interview with Nicodemus. May it not be truthfully said that those deeds of loving service were to Jesus a necessity as avenues of expression of his spiritual life?

This is not saying that every one who does deeds of kindness is in heart a believer in Jesus, and thus a partaker of the higher life of the Spirit; but it is saying that every one that is truly filled with the Spirit will give expression to his spirituality in deeds of loving, helpful service. There is no warrant in the life of Jesus for thinking, either, that the life of service, of organized, systematic, social service, is in any sense inconsistent with the highest type of spirituality; or, that true spirituality can exist and be maintained without such service. In other words, there is no warrant for thinking that the truly spiritual man will give attention only to what are conceived to be the distinctly spiritual activities of the Christian life. If the life of Jesus is to be taken as an illustration of the life that his disciples should live, then we are forced to the conclusion that he who does not yield his life up to genuine, loving, helpful, social service does not live the truly spirtual life.

When we turn from a study of the life of Jesus to a study of his teaching, we find this truth presented with strongest emphasis.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord," that is, not every one that is seemingly devout in the distinctively religious activities, "shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven."

Many seem disposed to think that by doing the will of his Father, Jesus meant simply the formal observance of religious ordinances. No doubt he did mean this, so far as these ordinances are of divine authority. But he very certainly meant vastly more than that.

"Ye are the salt of the earth."

"Ye are the light of the world."

"Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works."

"Love your enemies. Do good to them that hate you."

"Give to him that asketh of thee."

"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also unto them."

Read the parable of the Good Samaritan, and see there the picture that he draws of disinterested, helpful service, and hear him say, "Go, and do thou likewise."

Read his description of the last great assize, as he gives it in the twenty-fifth of Matthew, and hear him say:

"Come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. . . . Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." The meaning of which can be nothing less than that the only spiritual life that signifies anything before him and the Father is the life that is so charged and surcharged with the Spirit of Christ that it is compelled by that very spirituality to

seek expression in active, loving service of fellow-man.

True, Jesus at this place speaks only of remedial service, helping those in distress. But the principles he lays down embrace constructive as well as remedial service.

To-day we are seeing and seeing clearly that along with the call for the relieving of and caring for the unfortunate who fall among thieves on the Jericho road, there is the equally loud call to rout the thieves and clear up the road so that it will be safe for any one at any time to travel. While there is call to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and visit the sick and the incarcerated, there is equally loud call to correct social conditions so as to banish unnecessary hunger; do away with unnecessary lack of clothing; put away the causes that breed sickness and crime; and reform the prisons so that while they are places of restraint they are also institutions of reform, instead of being dens of vice, and instruments of revenge.

Of course believers shall not diminish by a whit their efforts to carry the gospel to the last man that is destitute of its healing truth, they must vastly increase this effort; nor shall they seek any less by prayer and meditation to keep open their souls to the fountains of the spiritual life; this, too, should be increased; but surely, in order to give this spiritual life adequate expression, in order to give adequate expression to the full purpose of the kingdom of Christ, the followers of Jesus must to larger degree than has ever yet prevailed, lay their hands to the great work of remedial and constructive social service, so that not only the bruised and needy may be cared for, but that the pirates that prey upon human life and happiness, in the form of greedy and selfish men and women as promoters of poverty, sickness, vice, and crime, may be abolished from human society.

Thank God, there is an increasing awakening and activity in these relations, as is evidenced by the many forms of reformatory activity in evidence throughout our nation. Political re-

form, industrial reform, commercial reform; institutions for the abolition of vice and crime; institutions seeking the abolition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors and in womanly virtue; movements for prison reform; conferences of charities and corrections; social purity leagues; their name is legion, all evidencing the fact that the center of gravity for public concern is indeed shifting from supreme interest in property, in wealth, in political preferment, to concern for and interest in the great questions of human well-being.

Whence does it all come? Nothing like it known to the nations of antiquity in their palmiest days. It is a child of Christian birth, led up to by the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, the product of the life and teaching of Jesus himself. It is a striking evidence that the government, the reign of Jesus Christ is increasing, a promise of the ultimate fulfillment of the optimistic conviction of Isaiah, "Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end. . . . The zeal of Jehovah of hosts will

perform this." The truth taught by Jesus is sinking deep into the hearts of men; his spirit is permeating more fully human society; his kingdom of righteousness is coming in larger measure.

How great, then, is the responsibility that rests upon the body of God's people, the visible representatives of the kingdom of Christ. In them this spirit of larger brotherhood has been born. Under their nurturing this spirit of service has been fostered and developed. And under their care and activity it must be maintained and made worldwide. Not that they shall assume the attitude of control; they must do a deeper, a more important task. They must themselves possess, exhibit, and give forth the spirit that shall by its own intangible presence and power vitalize the entire social fabric, and thus dominate through spirtual forces all the great movements for social betterment. This must be, or the great social movements will ultimately descend to the plane of mere systems of experimentation with social conditions and principles,

devoid of the life necessary to give the energy ncessary to efficiency.

In order to this, believers must "be filled with the Spirit." There is no question that this is a necessity in order to effective work in evangelism, the publishing of the gospel for winning men and women to Jesus Christ. But it is none the less necessary in order to efficiency in the great task of social regeneration and salvation. Just as the written word must furnish the basis of truth upon which this great task is to be wrought out, so the Spirit of God must furnish the impulse, the strength, the unselfish devotion necessary to the working out of the task. In other words, those who profess the name of Jesus must yield to the indwelling Spirit of Jesus Christ as he impels out to the life of remedial and constructive social service. Thus and thus alone will the church be able to contribute to making "the wilderness and the dry land be glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose."

BX9878.5 .K38
Christianity and the social weal.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00044 8797